

The Philanthropist.

PUBLISHED BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE OHIO ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

JAMES G. BIRNEY, EDITOR.

We are verily guilty concerning our brother... therefore, is this distress come upon us.

A. PUGH, PRINTER.

VOLUME 1.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, SEPTEMBER 30, 1836.

NUMBER 33.

THE PHILANTHROPIST

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AT

CINCINNATI, OHIO.

BY THE OHIO STATE ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

TERMS.

Two Dollars per annum, always payable in advance. Letters and Communications on business of the Office should be directed to C. K. Bushnell. Those relating to the Editorial Department to the Editor of the Philanthropist. In all cases post-paid. Names of Counties should be particularly mentioned in giving directions for sending the paper. An Advertisement making one square or less, will be inserted three times for one dollar.

TEXAS INSURRECTION.

The following article from the Cincinnati Daily Gazette, we commend to the attention of our readers. We think it places in a very clear light, the conduct of a certain portion of our citizens in relation to Texas affairs. He who runs, may read.

From the Cincinnati Daily Gazette.

Prosecutor Read and Texas.

We published yesterday, without comment, a communication from N. C. Read, Esq., on matters and things connected with Texas. Mr. Read has evinced himself very considerably, for the last eight or ten months, to Texas affairs. He has specified often and again—has concocted resolutions, and has called up meetings to adopt them, and has otherwise been active in procuring that to be done, which has been effected in aid of Texas, in this vicinity. In noticing certain proceedings in Fulton, in Monday's Gazette, the presence of Mr. Read was mentioned, not for the purpose of singling him out for distinction, but simply to note the extraordinary fact, that the Prosecuting Attorney should make himself conspicuous in denouncing the law of the land, and declaring a determination to disregard it. This fact occurred to me as evidencing too much of the prevalent spirit, to substitute the present dispositions of a supposed majority, right or wrong, for the established and permanent laws of the country: a spirit, which, I apprehend, ever has been the great active agent, in subverting regular governments, in every age of the world. Nothing in Mr. Read's communication changes my views of this subject.

Since early last winter, a series of transactions have passed before us, in open day, the undisguised object of which has been to enlist troops and procure arms to aid the Texans in their war with Mexico. Troops have been enlisted—arms have been obtained. Their military parades have been exhibited in our streets, they have embarked at our wharf, and proceeded to Texas, united themselves with troops and joined with them in battle against Mexico. In affecting all this many individuals have taken a prominent part. Public speaking has been one mode of operating upon the citizens, and when it so operates to induce action, the speaker and the actor become associated, in the consequences of the act, whether for commendation or crime.

Am I not correct, when I say men and arms, for military purposes, have been furnished here? Has not been boasted that, the cannon used at St. Jacinto, was supplied by Cincinnati? Is it not a fact, that every stand of public arms, deposited at this place, by the state, has been sent to Texas, with the assurance of those who had charge of them? And can any man seriously suppose that at the real character of these things can be changed, by calling the men "emigrants," and the arms "volunteer ware?" Associated pick-pockets and burglars substitute cant phrases for thief and robber; and yet Mr. Read, as prosecuting Attorney, would laugh at a defence raised upon such definitions. Who would not? And what is the distinction between the cases?

Is it an offence against any known law, thus to furnish men, and arms, to aid Texas, in her war with Mexico? Let Texas and Mexico be regarded as equally independent States, engaged in war with each other, the United States is neutral in this war. As a neutral, what are her duties, as one of the community of nations. Independent of the law of Congress, which will be given in its place, the law of nations defines the duty of the United States, in her present position. What this law of nations requires, thus pointed out, by Mr. Jefferson, when Secretary of State, in a letter to the French Minister Genet, of date, June 17, 1793:

"You think, sir, that this opinion is also contrary to the law of nature, and usages of nations. We are of opinion on that it is dictated by that law and usage; and this had been very maturely inquired into, before it was adopted as a principle of conduct. But we will not assume the exclusive right of saying that that law and usage is. Let us appeal to enlightened and disinterested judges. None is more than Vattel. He says, 1. 3. s. 104, 'as long as a neutral nation wishes to enjoy this situation with certainty, it ought to show, in every thing, an exact impartiality between the parties who are at war. For if it favored the one, to the prejudice of the other, it cannot complain when that other shall treat it as an adroit and associate of its enemy. Its neutrality could be a fraudulent one, of which none would be the dupes. Let us see then wherein consists that impartiality which a neutral people ought to observe.'"

"It regards war only, and comprehends two things. First, to give no succor when not obliged thereto; not to furnish, freely, either troops, arms, ammunition, or any thing which directly serves for war. I say, to give no succor and not to give it equally; or it would be absurd in a state to succor two enemies at the same time. And besides, it would be impossible to do it with equality, the same things, the same number of troops, the same quantity of arms, ammunition, &c. furnished in different circumstances, are no longer equivalent succors." If the neutral power may not, consistent with its neutrality, furnish men to either party, for their aid in war, it can either enrol them in the neutral territory, or the law of nations. Wolf, s. 1174, says, "Since the right of raising soldiers is a right of majesty; which cannot be violated by a foreign nation, it is not permitted to raise soldiers on the territory of another, without the consent of its sovereign." And Vattel, before cited, 1. 3. s. 16, "The right of raising soldiers belongs only to the nation, or its sovereign, no one can enrol them in a foreign country, without the permission of the sovereign. Those who undertake to engage soldiers in a foreign country without permission of the sovereign—and in general whosoever corrupts the subjects of others, violates one of the most sacred rights of the prince and of the nation. It is the crime which is called *lèse-majesté* or *lèse-patrie*. There is no poiced state which does not severely punish it." For I choose to refer you to the passage, rather than follow it through all its developments. The testimony of these and other writers on the law and usage of nations, with your own just reflections on them, will satisfy you that the United States, in prohibiting all the

belligerent powers from equipping, arming and manning vessels of war, in their ports, have exercised a right and a duty with justice, with great moderation. By our treaties with several of the belligerent powers, which are a part of the laws of our land, we have established a state of peace with them. But without appealing to treaties, we are at peace with them all, by the laws of nature; for, by nature's law, man is at peace with man, till some aggression is committed, which, by the same law, authorizes one to destroy another, as his enemy. For our citizens then, to commit murders and depredations, on the members of nations at peace with us, or to combine to do it, appeared to the executive, and to those whom they consulted, as much against the laws of the land as to murder or rob, or combine to murder or rob, its own citizens; and as much to require punishment, if done within their limits, or on the high seas, where they have a territorial jurisdiction, that is to say, one which reaches their own citizens only; this being an appropriate part of each nation on an element where all have a common jurisdiction. So say our laws as we understand them ourselves."

[State Papers, vol. 1, p. 91, &c.]

According to the law, as laid down by Mr. Jefferson, the Texas movements, in Cincinnati, are no better than combinations to murder and rob. Does this jar upon the feelings of Mr. Read and others who have acted with him? Let them recollect from whence and from whom the definition comes—it is not mere editorial vituperation. Congress, however, has not treated these doings as of a grade of crime equal to robbery or murder; it has constituted them misdemeanors. The act of April 30, 1818, sections one, two and six, provides:

1. Be it enacted, &c. That if any citizen of the United States shall, within the territory or jurisdiction thereof, accept and exercise a commission to serve a foreign prince, state, colony, district, or people, in war, by land or by sea, against any prince, state, colony, district, or people, with whom the United States are at peace, the person so offending shall be deemed guilty of a high misdemeanor, and shall be fined not more than two thousand dollars, and shall be imprisoned not exceeding three years.

2. That if any person shall, within the territory or jurisdiction of the United States, enlist or enter himself, or hire or retain another person to enlist or enter himself, or to go beyond the limits or jurisdiction of the U. S. States, with intent to be enlisted or entered in the service of any foreign prince, state, colony, district, or people, as a soldier, or as a marine or seaman, on board of any vessel of war, letter of marque, or privateer, every person, so offending, shall be deemed guilty of a high misdemeanor, and shall be fined not exceeding one thousand dollars, and be imprisoned not exceeding three years.

6. That if any person shall, within the territory or jurisdiction of the United States, begin or set on foot, or provide or prepare the means for, any military expedition or enterprise, to be carried on from thence against the territory or dominions of any foreign prince or state, or of any colony, district, or people, with whom the United States are at peace, every person, so offending, shall be deemed guilty of a high misdemeanor, and shall be fined not exceeding three thousand dollars, and imprisoned not more than three years.

The resolution, of which Mr. Read avows the authorship, declares a determination not to obey this law, but to nullify it. Is this allowable, in any citizen? Hear what Judge Patterson says, upon this head, in the case of Wm. S. Smith, speaking in reference to a section of the then existing law, in the same terms as the 6th section above quoted:

"The section which prohibits military enterprises against nations with which the United States are at peace, imparts no dispensing power to the president. Does the constitution give it? Far from it; for it explicitly directs, that he shall 'take care, that the laws be faithfully executed.' This instrument, which measures out the powers, and defines the duties of the president, does not vest in him any authority to set on foot a military expedition against a nation, with which the United States are at peace. And if a private individual, even with the knowledge and approbation of this high and pre-eminent officer of our government, should set on foot such a military expedition, how can he expect to be exonerated from the obligation of the law? Who holds the power of dispensation?—True, a *nolle prosequi* may be entered, a pardon may be granted; but these presume criminality, presume guilt, presume amenability to judicial investigation and punishment, which are very different from a power to dispense with the law. Suppose then, that every syllable of the affidavit is true, of what avail can it be on the present occasion? Of what use or benefit can it be to the defendant in a court of law? Does it speak to the defendant in justification? The president of the United States cannot control the statute, nor dispense with its execution, and still less can he authorize a person to do what the law forbids. If he could, it would render the execution of the laws dependent on his will and pleasure, which is a doctrine that has not been set up, and will not meet with any supporters in our government. In this particular, the law is paramount. Who has dominion over it? None but the legislature; and even they are not without their limitation in our republic. Will it be pretended, that the president could rightfully grant a dispensation and license to any of our citizens to carry on a war against a nation, with whom the United States are at peace? Ingenious and learned counsel may imagine and put a number of cases in the wide field of conjecture; but we are to take facts as we find them, and to argue from the existing state of things at the time. If we were at war with Spain, there is an end to the indictment; but, if at peace, what individual could lawfully make war, or carry on a military expedition against the dominions of his Catholic majesty? Smith & Ogden, 88, &c.

Here is the law of nations, the law of Congress, and the judicial opinion of a most eminent judge of the U. S. Supreme Court. All concur, in regarding as criminal, the doings that have passed before us, for some time by-gone, in regard to Texas. A very plain proposition is involved. Have military supplies, arms and ammunition been procured, for Texas, in Cincinnati? If they have, then has the law been violated; then are the individuals concerned obnoxious to legal punishment.

In the report of the doings of the identical Fulton Texas meeting, about which Mr. Read has written his communication, we find the following:

"The meeting was then addressed by N. C. Read and Captain Lawrence."

Again:

"It was moved and seconded, That a committee of five be appointed to assist Capt. Lawrence in raising recruits and funds for the cause of Texas, which being put to vote, the following gentlemen were elected:—

"B. Hazen, L. Fagin, A. Gordon, E. Townsend, and E. Anderson."

Now, this very self same Captain Lawrence has opened and advertised a rendezvous, on Front street, for engaging emigrants: in other words, enlisting

recruits. He proclaims that he acts under a Captain's commission from Texas. Mr. Read acts in concert with him, in declaring,

"That no law, either human or divine, except such as are formed by tyrants and for their sole benefit, forbids our assisting the Texans; and such law, if any exist, we do not as Americans choose to obey."

And this, in direct contradiction to the public and statute law above published, Mr. Read represents as merely using the liberty of speech!! Mr. Read's speeches, and the acts of Captain Lawrence, go hand in hand. It is an insult to common sense to assume, that so gross a violation of law can be evaded, upon the grounds put forth by Mr. Read.

I have nothing to say to the *rhodomontade* in which Mr. Read has dealt so largely. It may go for what it is worth. My business is with palpable facts and existing laws. I would, however, remark, in conclusion, that no appeal has yet been made to Cincinnati, for aid to the suffering women, children, and decrepit old men of Texas, exposed by war to the most horrible calamities. Our sympathies have been invoked, for soldiers and munitions of war.—

Let Mr. Read confine himself to these subjects.—

When he makes an appeal in behalf of suffering humanity, in the form of bread and covering, then he may talk about it. No law forbids supplying these to an enemy. Mr. Read's appeals have been for the tented field, and that is quite a different case.

I have called our Texan patriots '*land brawlers*.' I cannot take it back. Has not a whole Kentucky corps come home, in dudgeon, because of some difficulty about land? Are not the Texans themselves disputing to the knife, upon the same subject?—And why do our patriot volunteers prefer to be soldiers in Texas, to soldiers at home, in defence of our own citizens, beleaguered by a savage foe? It is land!—speculation! Any thing, rather than a generous disinterested love of the liberty that good government and wise laws secure and make permanent.

Origin and Cause of the Texas Revolution.

No. VI.

When it was proposed to organize a Federal Republic in Mexico, after the brief reign of the Emperor Iturbide, delegates were elected by the people, to meet in convention for the purpose. This body was denominated a "Constituent Congress," and was invested with authority to frame a constitution, in much the same way as did the "Convention" which framed that of the United States of the north. But in providing for future amendments or alterations of the constitution, which was subsequently adopted by the nation, the calling of such conventions was dispensed with; and the necessary power was delegated to the general Congress, to be exercised, should the state of the country require it, under certain formal rules of proceeding. One of the Articles of the constitution, granting this authority to the National Congress, is in these words:—

"170. In order to reform or amend this Constitution or the Constitutional Act, shall be observed, besides the rules prescribed in the foregoing articles, all the requisites provided for the formation of laws, excepting the right to make observations granted to the President, in article 106."

The Congress was thus constituted a "Convention," for this special purpose, entirely independent of the Executive. The "right to make observations granted to the President," in the formation of general laws, was the same in principle as that of the veto power given to the President of this Republic. In the case before us, it was withheld. It will therefore appear, that the Mexican Congress was duly authorized to "reform or amend" the national constitution, when the state of the country should require it. Whether the actual state of things did call for it, or not, is a pertinent subject for investigation, before we join the revolutionists in their condemnation of the measure. That body acted upon its constitutional responsibility, and it may be presumed independently of all authority but that of the people, to whom alone the members were amenable for the abuse of their power.

In a previous number of these essays, I stated that the principles of "nullification," as professed by many in this country, had taken deep root, and were often practically exemplified, in the Mexican confederacy. The Texas colonists, individually, and some of the states, in their "sovereign" capacity, acted them out thoroughly; and not only were the tranquillity and prosperity of the nation thus endangered, but even, the stability of its free institutions, and the permanency of the government were rendered wholly insecure, and liable to eventual destruction. The more intelligent and reflecting among the Mexican people, were fully sensible of this. They found, by an experience of years, that the complicated system of government, adopted by their Anglo-American neighbors, was not sufficiently understood by the mass of their citizens, and consequently not adapted to their state and condition. In considering the proposal for a change in the constitution, the municipality of Toluca expressed the following views and sentiments:—

"Feeling, therefore, the pressing and imperious necessity of terminating and hereafter preventing the abuses which have frequently been made of power by the authorities of the different States—using it to the prejudice of the people, with whose happiness (the prime object of all social institutions) they had been entrusted, but which they sacrificed to their own private interests or to disgraceful passions: Convinced, also, that it is indispensably necessary to adopt a mode of government more consistent with the establishment of an administration so economical as to repair the poverty, decay, and ruin, to which the profession and complexities of the present system has reduced the country, and so strong as to extricate it from oppressive and oppressive bankruptcy; to supply our internal credit; opposed also to tyrannical and absolute power by the unbiassed multitude, tired of enduring sometimes heavy and bloody anarchy; sometimes cruel and bloody anarchy; desirous at length to see perpetually and irrevocably secured the peaceable enjoyment of a moderate national and constitutional freedom, and of the other social rights which have hitherto been merely nominal, and basely violated," &c. &c.

With this understanding of their state and condition, and this desire to improve it, in order to secure the peace and happiness of themselves and the successive generations of their posterity, the change in the constitution was proposed, and sanctioned voluntarily by an immense majority of the Mexican people. It was also finally 'acquiesced in' by them unanimously, with the exception of a small fraction of the inhabitants of one of the states—and that fractional part composed almost entirely of foreigners, many of whom had not acquired citizenship in the Republic. This is the *status quo* (though not the real one), now urged by the Texas insurrectionists, for waging war against the Mexican government. They did not pretend to have suffi-

cient cause of complaint, to adopt measures for their entire independence, so long as the hope existed that the federal form of government could be continued. It is evident, therefore, that they were not oppressed. But they deny to the great mass of the Mexican people the right to abrogate such institutions as their own experience teaches them are unsuited to their condition; unless, indeed, they will give up a large portion of their country, and leave a great number of their brethren to the exclusive control and unapproved government of foreigners. Texas never did exercise the authority of an independent sovereignty. Neither did the colonists ever, exclusively, possess the attributes of a community, clothed with any political power whatever. When they settled in the country, they took up their abode among the native inhabitants, promised obedience to their laws, and were ever legally subject to all the regulations of their government. They never possessed a shadow of legal title to a foot of the soil, further than what a part of them acquired by the munificence and liberality of that same people and government, and what they obtained by purchase from them. What authority, then, can they claim, to dictate to the Mexican nation the formula of its political institutions—or demand the relinquishment of its right to possess and govern the country in which they have thus been permitted to settle themselves? It was an acknowledged axiom with the founders of this republic, that whenever any form of government fails to secure to its citizens generally the possession of their inalienable privileges, in the "pursuit of happiness," &c.—"it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it, and to institute a new government, laying its foundation on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness." Yet they never promulgated the doctrine, that a small minority in a community should exercise the right to prevent the majority from carrying this principle into effect. To elucidate the subject more fully, let us suppose a case, which would be strictly analogous to the one before us.

At the close of the American revolution, and previous to the organization of our present form of government, a part of the province of Pennsylvania was settled by a considerable number of Germans. They had migrated from the monarchical principalities of Europe, or at least from countries whose political institutions were different in their principles and organic structure from ours. We will suppose they did not approve the democratic republican form of government which our fathers established under the present constitution. They composed a small part of the population of the province. They were settled among the native inhabitants, (or there were a large number of natives in the same part with themselves) whose ancestors had opened farms and built up villages long before these foreigners had asked or obtained permission to fix their residence there. They had declared allegiance to the government under the first confederation; they promised obedience to the laws and regulations which should in future be enacted by the legal authorities; and they were kindly treated, and in a few instances advanced to stations of honor, trust and profit. But although the native inhabitants in the province outnumbered them, as more than three or four to one, we will assume that they refused their sanction to the government, under the federal organization of this union. The natives were almost unanimous in giving their assent; all, except these foreigners, approved or finally 'acquiesced' in the proposed change.

Now, let us suppose, that in this state of things, these Germans had declared for the old confederation, taken up arms to resist the authority of the general Congress, called upon their brethren in Europe to aid them in their rebellion, and finally declared the independence of Lancaster, Berks, and as many other contiguous counties as they might eventually be able to conquer: nay, suppose they had expressed the intention in their "Declaration," to make themselves masters of the whole state of Pennsylvania, a part of Virginia and of Ohio, and nearly all the territory of Michigan, while they were still dependent upon the Germans in Europe for men, money, and other means to accomplish their object. What, I ask, would the people of the United States have said and done? What would their brethren, 'their own countrymen' in Europe, consider their duty in such a case? What judgment, indeed, would the nations of the civilized world have pronounced upon their daring "usurpation" of power—their ambitious, yet impotent efforts—their total disregard of justice, or their ignorance of the fundamental principles of human government? I need not say what the impartial verdict would have been.

Tell me not, that the comparison here falls in the application to our subject. It is strictly correct in every essential particular. If there is any variance in the similitude, the Germans of Pennsylvania would have been more justifiable than the Texas colonists in raising the standard of revolt, had they objected to the change in the form of government upon the principle above stated. Many of the former settled in the country long before the native inhabitants threw off the shackles of foreign domination, and helped to fight the battles of national liberty. But the latter (with the exception of a very few) introduced themselves after the independence of the nation had been secured, by the establishment of a new government. Those who are acquainted with the history of Texas colonization, well know that I have fairly stated facts and circumstances; and it will be found, in the end, that my inferences are just and my conclusions undeniable.

No. VII.

I have stated that "a vast combination was entered into, (though not formally organized,) having in view the re-establishment of slavery in the Texas country, &c. I might rest the assertion on the evidence already adduced in proof of this; but, in order to illustrate it more clearly, I will ask the reader's attention to a few more facts and observations connected with the subject.

This design was openly manifested a short time after the settlement of the famous "Missouri Question," by which it was decided that slavery should never be extended to any portion of the territory of the United States, above the line of 36 degrees and 30 minutes of north latitude. When the treaty, defining the western boundary of Louisiana, was ratified by our government, many of our citizens were dissatisfied, because the Texas country was not included within its limits. To some of these the question of slavery, in that region, did not probably then occur; but soon after the colonization commenced, under Austin, it became a subject of general conversation and newspaper remark, in our southern states. All the writers for the papers, at that period, contemplated the annexation of the territory to that of the United States. Among the first who publicly advocated the measure, particularly in reference to the extension of the system of slavery, were the writers of two or more series of essays, originally published at St. Louis, in Missouri, over the signatures of "*Americanus*," and "*La Salle*,"—

These essays were attributed to the pen of the Hon. T. H. Benton, now a Senator in the Congress of the United States. To give the reader a correct idea of their drift, and the manner in which the doctrines they inculcated were received in different parts of the Union, I submit a few extracts from sundry publications, issued soon after they made their appearance. It may be proper, however, to premise, that our government then (then completely under the influence of the slave-holding interest) was endeavoring to obtain a cession of the territory in question, and that it was at the period of the last invasion of Mexico, by the armies of Spain. The first quotation which I shall make, is from a paper said to be then under the control of the present Governor Mc. Duffie, of South Carolina.

From the Edgefield (S. C.) Carolinian.

"The acquisition of Texas, relinquished by the government of the United States to the magnanimous Ferdinand VII. by the Florida treaty of 1819, is now a subject of much interest in the western states. This valuable territory has now devolved on the republic of Mexico, and on the condition of that country, suffering under invasion and civil war, and scanty finances, it is supposed that the retrocession might be obtained for a reasonable equivalent. Great confidence is expressed that the administration will embrace the present favorable occasion of regaining an extensive and fertile region of country within the natural limits of the United States.—Some imposing essays originally published in the St. Louis Beacon, with the signature of 'Americanus,' and attributed to Col. Benton, of the Senate, explaining the circumstances of the treaty of 1819, and displaying the advantages of the retrocession, have operated upon the public mind in the west with electrical force and rapidity. The writer produces strong circumstantial proof that the surrender of Texas resulted from the subservience of our negotiator in Spain, in her contest with Mexico, together with the powerful subsiding motive of hostility to the southern and western sections of our own country.

"This large fragment of the Mississippi valley, affording sufficient territory for four or five slave-holding states, was unceremoniously sacrificed with scarcely a pretext of a demand for it on the part of Spain. The time of the negotiations was during the heat of the debate on the Missouri question—the place was Washington, whither the negotiation had been unnecessarily removed, while it was proceeding prosperously at Madrid, and where the restrictionists were then assembled in all their strength, and the negotiator was Mr. Adams, the friend and associate of the most thorough-going among those restrictionists. 'Americanus,' exposes the evils to the United States of this surrender, under twelve distinct heads. Two of them of particular interest to this section of the country, are that it brings a non-slave-holding empire in juxtaposition with the slave-holding south west, and diminishes the outlet for the Indians, inhabiting the states of Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, and Tennessee."

From the Charleston (S. C.) Mercury.

"It is not improbable that he [President Jackson] is now examining the propriety and practicability of a retrocession of the vast territory of Texas, an enterprise loudly demanded by the welfare of the west, and which could not fail to exercise an important and favorable influence upon the future destinies of the south, by increasing the votes of the slave-holding states in the United States Senate."

From the Nashville Banner.

"The Mexicans, steeped to the lips in poverty, threatened with a powerful invasion by the mother country, will part with this property or any thing else for the sake of money. Now is the time, and this is the hour, to strike for our country's weal."

"I believe President Jackson has a listening, attentive ear. It is said that he would as soon scan the opinions of a Corporal as those of a Major General, and that he with equal readiness would adopt or reject either, as his judgement might determine. Believing this to be the case, I venture to make the above suggestion—with the addition, that there is not one moment to be lost."

From the Arkansas Gazette, 1830.

"PURCHASE OF TEXAS.—As the subject of the purchase of Texas has engrossed much of the attention of our politicians for a year or two past, it may not perhaps be improper to state that we are in possession of information, derived from a source entitled to the highest credit, which destroys all hope of the speedy acquisition of that country by the United States. Col. Butler, the Charge d'Affaires of the United States to Mexico, was specially authorized by the President to treat with that government for the purchase of Texas. The present predominant party are decidedly opposed to the ceding any portion of its territory. [The writer might have added, and so are all parties.] No hopes need therefore be entertained of our acquiring Texas until some other party more friendly to the United States than the present shall predominate in Mexico, and perhaps [the italics are the editor's] not until the people of Texas shall throw off the yoke of allegiance to that government, which they will do no doubt, so soon as they shall have a reasonable pretext for doing so.* At present they are probably subject to as few exactions and impositions as any people under the sun."

Were it necessary, I could make many other extracts of similar character and import with the above; but I will, at present, only direct the attention of the reader to a few more, from papers opposed to the scheme, and by whom its existence is admitted and censured.

From the New York Daily Advertiser.

"If Texas should be added to the United States, it is not an extravagant supposition that there may in process of time be 12 or 15 additional slave states incorporated into the Union."

If, then, the free states do not intend to surrender themselves at discretion; if they do not feel inclined to yield up their weight and influence in the national affairs; if they are not disposed to become tributary to the slave states, and see all the wealth and energy of the republic placed under the sovereign control and disposal of these states, it is incumbent on them to watch this project with the deepest solicitude and care, and to check on the onset every effort for the accomplishment of such a wild and perilous undertaking."

*This idea prevailed so generally in Mississippi, at the period here alluded to, that the electors of one district put the following, among other interrogatories, to their candidates for Congress:—

"Your opinion of the acquisition of Texas, and how—whether by force or treaty—and whether the law preventing the emigration of the Americans is not evidence of apprehension that that province wishes to secede from the Mexican government—and whether, if requested, we ought to give the seceding military assistance—and what would be the effect of the acquisition of Texas upon our planting interest."

From the Pennsylvania Gazette, Sept. 1839.
"The acquisition of Texas promises to be a leading measure of the present administration, and without doubt one of great magnitude and importance. This will be very apparent from the fact, as stated, that the territory in question will make nine states as large as Kentucky, to which add the still larger consideration, that it is designed to make these nine states, slave states. We are told also that the proper steps have been taken to procure the cession." It is high time, therefore, for the northern interest, the non-slaveholding states, to look around, to see how the balance of power, which it was the object of the Federal constitution to create and preserve, will be affected by this bold undertaking. We are much pleased by the following remarks of the New York American:—

From the American.
"The Richmond Enquirer, with one of its hints, which are meant to signify a great deal, says, 'The statesmen who are at the head of our affairs, are not the men we take them to be, if they have not already pursued the proper steps for obtaining the cession of Texas, even before the able non-boss of Americans' saw the light. But nous verrons!'"
"We are therefore to understand that measures are already in train for the recovery of Texas. 'The able non-boss of Americans' put the importance of this recovery to southern men and southern interests, on the ground of the space and advantages which that country will afford for the future existence of slave states.' Within this boundary of Texas, 'nine states,' says Americans, 'as large as Kentucky,' may be formed."
"When the great, and we do not hesitate to say, unjust preponderance of the slave states in the existing confederacy is considered, it may well cause the inhabitants of the free states to pause and consider the effect upon our institutions and union, of the increase, by the half dozen, of these states, bound together by one common bond of peril, of profit and of political power. The moral considerations, too, which belong to the subject, connected with the new and vast market, that this province would open to the domestic slave trade, not less atrocious in principle, if somewhat milder in practice, than that which on the coast of Africa is denounced as 'piracy,' and punished with death, will not fail to present themselves with force to the minds of all considerate men."

From the Boston Palladium, 1839.
"The 'Political Gridiron,' a Louisiana paper, is seeking to embroil Texas. The United States troops, it says, should take possession of Texas without delay; and if General Houston has gone to that country, as is asserted, for the purpose of revolutionizing it, we may expect to hear shortly of his raising his flag."

In addition to the writings of various editors of newspapers and their correspondents, we might enumerate the speeches of distinguished political orators, members of legislative bodies, &c. tending to show the general anxiety of the people in our southern states for the acquisition of Texas, and the certain calculations they made on the establishment and perpetuation of slavery therein. I will, however, quote a few remarks from only one or two. In the Virginia Convention of 1829, Judge Upshur, of the Supreme Court, observed, in a speech of considerable length, that if Texas should be obtained, which he strongly desired, it would raise the price of slaves, and be a great advantage to the slaveholders in that state.—Mr. Chisolm also stated in the Virginia assembly, in the year 1832, that the price of slaves fell twenty-five per cent. within two hours after the news was received of the non-importation Act which was passed by the legislature of Louisiana. Yet he believed the acquisition of Texas would raise their price fifty per cent. at least.

COMMUNICATIONS

Essay on Slavery.

BY HEBERIAN JOHNSON, BAPTIST MINISTER.

NO. I.

In the present state of things, it is impossible to speak or write the whole truth on the subject of slavery, without being thought malevolent. The reason is, slavery is a popular sin. All popular sins share largely in the sympathies and favor of the public. This makes them the more dangerous and destructive. When the bad example of a good man coincides with public sentiment, such example is calculated to do vastly more mischief than it would, were it the example of a bad man, or were it not sanctioned by public sentiment. I dare not say, how far a good man may be misled by public sentiment and the bad habits of those around him,—yet I am satisfied from an acquaintance with slaveholders, that many good men hold slaves. These good men do not realize, that slavery is such a flagrant crime as it is. If they did, they could not continue to be slaveholders, because it requires a much greater degree of depravity to cause a man to commit a flagrant crime, realizing its nature,—than it does to commit the same crime without realizing its nature. Men will be dealt with in the day of judgment according to the degree of depravity which is exercised in their conduct. Luke xii, 47, 48. "That servant, which knew his lord's will, and prepared not himself, neither did according to his will, shall be beaten with many stripes: but he that knew not, and did commit things worthy of stripes, shall be beaten with few stripes." Slaveholders are by no means wholly ignorant of the fact that slavery is a sin; yet many who are entangled in it, suppose the difficulty of getting out is so great, that they are justifiable in resting, for the present, in this snare of the devil. Notwithstanding this, I am persuaded, that no good man ever approved of slavery. Some are so modest on this subject, they wish to say little or nothing about it, and seem to wish all others to be like themselves. One reason for their silence, if I understand them, is—they believe, some, yes many, good men are slaveholders. This, so far from being a reason why little or nothing should be said on this subject, is one of the most alarming circumstances attending slavery, and one of the strongest reasons, why all who have right views on it should cry aloud and spare not.

Had good men never, in any way, sanctioned slavery, these United States, would before now have been as free of slaves as they are of kings. The constitution of the United States, and of each state, grant freedom of speech and of the press to each American citizen. All the statutes of the slave states to the contrary are unconstitutional. The freedom of speech and of the press is a sacred privilege which I wish never to abuse. No man abuses this privilege by speaking the truth plainly on the subject of slavery, or any other subject of equally vital importance. Slavery is one of the most appalling evils—whether it be regarded as a natural evil or a moral evil. The principle of slavery is, that a man may have property in man. Were this principle universally imbibed and universally reduced to practice, men would make a universal effort to possess each other as property. This effort would produce universal strife, confusion, misery and destruction. The white man being judge in his own case, would conclude, that he has a right to enslave the black man—the black man being judge also in his own case would conclude, that he has a right to enslave the white man. Or were it so, that white men could not obtain black men for slaves, and that black men could not obtain white men for slaves, each man being judge in his own case, the wise man would conclude that he has a right to enslave the foolish—the foolish, that he has a right to enslave the wise—the rich, that he has a right to enslave the poor—the poor, that he has a right to enslave the rich—the strong, that he has a right to enslave the feeble—the feeble, that he has a right to enslave the strong—the virtuous, that he has a right to enslave the vicious—and the vicious, that he has a right to enslave the virtuous.

If a man can in justice have property in man, as there is no rule by which to determine who shall be the possessor, and who the possessed, the legitimate conclusion is, that every man has a right to possess all others, if he has the means of enslaving them. Hence slavery universally practiced amounts to nothing else, than a system of universal robbery. No nation and community can long prosper and keep all branches of business in a healthful state, where labor is not honorable, and where industry is not cherished as a virtue. No honest occupation should be regarded as dishonorable. The tendency of slavery is, to bring labor into disrepute by associating it with the degraded part of community. This is a temptation to dishonesty in slave

states, to spend their time in idleness and other vices. God made men to be free, and deeply engraved in their nature a love of liberty. Hence, as a general rule, they cannot be made to act advantageously and without being interested in their actions. Slavery robs the enslaved of every earthly motive to labor, except to escape punishment—earthly motives to labor, except to escape punishment—and, notwithstanding slaves are reproached with indolence, and the tendency of slavery is considered, it is astonishing, that they take so much interest in their labor as they do. Owing to slavery's making labor dishonorable, and to its taking away most of the motives of slaves to labor, slave labor is never so productive as free, and the slave states are not near so populous and wealthy as the free.—The slave states are in continual danger of insurrections among the slaves. Hence, slavery is a great natural evil to the free inhabitants of all the slave states. Many slaves are fed and clothed enough to make them comfortable, so far as food and raiment are concerned. Many are not corrected with severity; yet the condition of such is extremely perilous. They know not at what moment their masters may die, and they be sold to the highest bidder—the father to one man—the child, to another—and the mother, to a third; each to be carried into a different section of the country never to see each other again. The sufferings of many slaves from the want of sufficient food and clothing, from excessive toil and the severity with which they are beaten, are indescribable. Slaves are also kept in great ignorance, to prevent them from knowing the worth of liberty, from devising plans and using the means to obtain it. Hence, a greater natural evil than slavery is to the enslaved, can scarcely be conceived.

Slavery, as a moral evil, is a violation, or fosters a violation, of every principle of morality in the Bible. There are many, both of whites and blacks in slave states, who are very pious; yet no candid man who is acquainted with the morality of those states, can deny that slavery fosters Sabbath-breaking, profane swearing, and irreligion, in general; thus violating the great principle of morality, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart." Slavery violates the second great principle of morality, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." If slaveholders love their neighbors as themselves, they have a bad method of showing it—or if they do to others as they would that others should do to them, they are far more willing to be held as property than I have supposed them to be. Perhaps they will say, as I have heard it said, that they do to their slaves as they would be done to under like circumstances. Whether I am uncharitable or not, I cannot believe any man of common sense to be sincere in making such statements; yet if any man is sincere in making such statements, let him and his family (if he has one) be reduced to the condition of slaves in general, hold and treated as property, and he will be quite as sincerely of another opinion. The Bible commands us to love even our enemies, and not to respect the persons of men. Matt. v. 44. "Love your enemies." James ii. 9. "If you have respect to persons, ye commit sin."

Slavery cherishes an unreasonable prejudice against those who have never by crimes forfeited their right to liberty and kind treatment. The Bible commands parents to raise their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. Slavery deprives many parents of the privilege of discharging this duty. The Bible commands children to obey and honor their parents—slavery deprives many children of the privilege of discharging this duty. The Bible forbids murder—slavery, in many instances, cherishes murderous feelings in overseers and masters towards slaves, and, in some instances, is the cause of actual murder. The Bible forbids adultery—slavery promotes adultery to a shameful extent. In thousands of instances, among slaves, men and women live together as man and wife, without the sanction of marriage. In thousands of instances among slaves, husbands and wives are torn apart, and compelled to live single or marry again before either party is dead. Also, the shameful amalgamation of whites and blacks, without the sanction of marriage, shows, that adultery is common in all the slave states. The Bible forbids stealing—slavery is a legalized system of man-stealing. Slaveholders profess to hold their slaves by two tenures: first, by purchase—this tenure is good, if slaveholders purchased their slaves of the right owners; if not, the tenure by purchase is bad. To test this, I ask of whom were their slaves purchased? All men own themselves—if, therefore, slaveholders purchased the slaves of themselves, they are held by a just tenure. But as slaves did not sell themselves, I ask again, of whom were they purchased? All who are correctly informed on the subject, answer—of man-stealers. What right, then, by purchase, have slaveholders to their slaves, but the man-stealer's right? If the fountain of a right be corrupt, the stream cannot become pure, by descending to a thousand generations. Hence, as the slaveholder's right to his slaves by purchase was originally nothing but the man-stealer's right, it will never be any thing else. Second: the children of purchased men are said to be born slaves. This tenure, is, if possible, worse than the first—for men, by selling themselves, cannot in justice make their children slaves. All patriots and lovers of liberty, say, "We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." How, then, can it be possible for children to be born slaves? Slaveholders would not hesitate to accuse a black man with man-stealing, should he take their children and hold them as property—yes, if all the laws in the world should sanction the deed, they would not hesitate a moment to condemn him as a man-stealer. Why, then, should they complain of being slandered when they are accused with man-stealing, because they, under sanction of wrong laws, take and hold as property the children of black men? If the black man who takes white children, and holds them as property, under the sanction of wrong laws, is a man-stealer,—the white man who takes black children, and holds them as property under the sanction of wrong laws, is also a man-stealer. The Bible forbids bearing false witness—slavery cherishes a disposition in those who are favorable to slavery, to slander, misrepresent, and falsely accuse black men. One fault in a black man is more magnified and talked of, than a half dozen in a white man. This is especially the case since many of our ablest white men have commenced pleading the cause of the oppressed. The Bible forbids men to covet any thing which belongs to their neighbor—slavery allows men to covet and take every thing which belongs to their neighbor,—yes, himself not excepted. The Bible commands ministers of the gospel to preach the gospel to every creature—slavery throws many obstructions in the way. The Bible commands men to search the Scriptures—slavery prevents many men from even learning to read the Scriptures. Thus the way of the moral improvement of slaves is much obstructed, while all the avenues of vice are left open. Hence the doctrine that a man can have property in his fellow man, is one of the most egregious errors in morals—and slaveholding is one of the blackest crimes on earth. Some tell us that we ought to distinguish between the use and abuse of a thing. This is true of every thing which can be lawfully used, but it is nonsense, to talk of distinguishing between the use and abuse of sin. Slavery is sin, only sin, and sin always.

LETTER FROM THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE NEW YORK ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.
After we had read the following very eloquent epistle, we could not help thinking of that choice proverb of the wise man—"A word fitly spoken, is like apples of gold, in pictures of silver."
Utica, August 26th, 1836.
To the Executive Committee of the Ohio State Anti-Slavery Society, at Cincinnati.
Dear and Honored Brethren—Fellow laborers in the kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ; and in the cause of his despised and oppressed poor. The shout of your ruthless persecutors has fallen upon our ears; and amid the

pauses of the storm, we have been cheered by the calm and firm tones of your own unchanged voice. We hasten to mingle our hearts with yours—to sing, with you, of mercy and of judgment—the mercy that has unmasked a nation's enemies, and shielded your heads, and guarded your precious lives, when the floods of ungodly men rose up against you;—the justice that has visited upon an oppressive and callous nation, a heavy blow upon her own boasted but despised liberties.

We know we need not occupy our time or yours with lengthened exhortations to courage and patience under your own sufferings. We know you will not think it strange concerning the fiery trail that is to try you, as though some strange thing had happened unto you. It was in no mere worldly enterprise—it was in no scheme of partisan ambition—it was in no partnership with those who seek their own things and not the things of Jesus Christ and his suffering members, that you banded yourselves together. Of your plundered property—of your own invaded domiciles—of your own insulted persons—of your own endangered lives—of your own outraged rights—of your own accumulated wrongs—we are persuaded that you have comparatively little. Of these topics we shall, accordingly, say little, in tendering to you our condolence and our sympathies.

We mourn, rather, with you, the infatuation of those, who are aiming, through your vitals, a death blow to their own, their children's, and their country's freedom. We mourn, with you, the affecting indications, in the midst of us, of that blindness of mind, and that hardness of heart, which constitute the most fearful presages of a nation's downfall. We mourn, with you, the deep wound inflicted, in the house of his professed friends, upon the cause of our common Savior. We mourn with you, that those who profess to be his disciples, and claim to be the ministers of his truth, should not only "stand aloof" from the "cause of the poor and needy," should not only count it obedience to Jesus Christ to disregard and despise his little ones—should not only forget that "inasmuch as they relieve not and succor not the least of these his brethren, they do it not unto Him"—but, as though these negligences, for which the Great Judge has seen fit to pronounce his anticipated sentence of condemnation, were not sufficient for them—as though the quiet acceptance of the sinner's seat, the menial drudgery of wresting the Scriptures from the support of impunity and heathenism, of robbery and crime, could not suffice to satisfy their greediness—should now think they do God service, when, in defiance of all human and divine laws, combine with the sons of violence, to inflict injuries and outrage upon those who presume to "show the house of Jacob their son, and remember them that are in bonds as bound with them."

For things like these, dear brethren, with you, we mourn. Nor can we cease to sigh and cry while such abominations are committed in our land. Yet, while we thus grieve, let us remember that we are permitted to rejoice in the all pervading and over-ruling Providence of them whose power can bring light out of darkness, and good out of evil.—He stilleth the tumult of the sea, and the raging of the people. The wrath of man shall praise him, and the remainder he will restrain. Why do the heathen rage and the people imagine a vain thing? The kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together, against the Lord and his anointed, saying, let us break their bands asunder, and cast away their cords from us! He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh; the Lord shall have them in derision. His king is on his holy hill of Zion. He has declared the decree. The rolling of his chariot is onward. Nations may dash themselves, as the potter's vessel, under his wheels—but his march is still onward, till all his enemies are put under his feet.

In the certainty of His reign, and in the glory of His triumph, let us rejoice. Yet a little while, and the wicked shall not be, but the meek shall inherit the earth, and the upright shall delight themselves in the abundance of peace. Let us pause, and ponder, for a moment, the delightful results which, under the good Providence of God, and in accordance with the known and established laws of moral cause and effect, in his moral government may yet spring from the painful scenes you are now called to witness, and through which you are now called to pass. Let us enquire diligently whether these results may not include some germ of promise for our guilty but beloved country—whether, along with the sure prospect of "deliverance to the Captain," (which the recorded oath and veracity of a God has already rendered secure) there can be not a bow of hope for an oppressive but repentant nation?

If it be the purpose of God to save our nation from destruction, we well know that it must be in a way of national penitence and amendment. If the churches in our land, are to escape total apostasy and extinction, we know they must repent, and bring forth fruit meet for repentance. But what hope was there of a cure, so long as the deadly malediction was pressing upon her vitals, unrevoked? Or what instrumentality could be better adapted to arouse a slumbering people, and convict a self-righteous church, than the astounding and painful developments in your city, with a few weeks, and a few days past?

If the people of Ohio and of the Union, are not already past feeling and past hope, if the last vestige of political foresight as well as moral discernment has not ceased from among them—they must now see what it has hitherto been so difficult to show them—that there is no possible alternative between the enfranchisement of the slave and subjugation of the free—that the common Father of all men never intended the liberties of a portion of his equal children should long be preserved, while they neglected to claim the equal liberties of their brethren; that the movements of his providence render such an arrangement impossible—that the changeless constitution of human nature, renders the very supposition an absurdity! The voice of the slaveholders, through their associates in your city, has abundantly proclaimed that slavery cannot stand, except it be upon the ruins of the free press. And with equal distinctness and solemnity, has the voice of the non-slaveholding aristocracy been heard to decree, that the free press of the non-slaveholding states must fall! At their bidding, nay, with the violence of their hands the free press has fallen! The press that remains, has registered its own confession that it is not free, and DARES NOT "ADVANCE an opinion" amidst "the actors" of this scene. Yes! In the face of Europe and of the world, it has been recorded that freedom of the press, in the commercial metropolis of one of the free states of America has already passed away, and is known only in the history of the things that have been; the things that may or may not hereafter, again be!

Is there not reason, dear brethren, to hope, that the thunder tones of an announcement like this, may suffice to rouse freedom from their slumbers, and freedom from its grave?

Depend upon it, dear brethren, the spell of apathy and the delusion of confiding credulity, on the minds of many, many, thousands, has been suddenly and irrevocably broken. Whatever of scepticism there may have been, a month or two ago, in respect to the SETTLED LEAGUE between the M'Duffies of the south, and their aristocratic "brethren of the north," to crucify the freedom of the free, in order to secure the continued slavery of the slave—will there be nothing of such a skepticism remain among the intelligent readers of the passing news note. To the "imprudent and reckless" aristocracy of Cincinnati has been reserved the task of certifying, over their own signatures, the truth of this oft reiterated, but seemingly incredible charge. Nor have they failed to state, in terms too plain to need elucidation, too explicit to permit evasion, that in the prosecution of their plans they aim at REVOLUTION; they trample the CONSTITUTION under foot, they bid defiance to the sovereign power and their laws! The issue is now fairly made up. It is understood by all. It is the constitution, order, law, and liberty for all American, on the one hand!—It is revolution, anarchy, mobocracy, on the other!

*Cincinnati Daily Gazette.

Slavery, and the slavery of the American people, on the other. There is no room for neutrality. There is no possibility of mistake. There is no way of escape. There is no middle ground. There is no alternative. If the nation is to be saved, it must be saved by exertions which nothing but a crisis like the present, could have called forth; by discoveries which nothing short of the scenes of Cincinnati could have revealed.

Be assured dear brethren, no occurrences have hitherto taken place (not even in our own city, where the violence of our enemies has most gloriously strengthened us) so directly calculated to convince the hardy yeomanry of central New York, and we may add, of the middle and eastern states, that their own interests and liberties are identified with those of the slave—that American freedom is no longer a question of geography or of color—that AMERICANS MUST BECOME ABOLITIONISTS OR SLAVES, as the occurrences of the last few days in Cincinnati indicate. Previous occurrences had given them reason to suspect it. Now, they see, they feel, they understand, they know it. They have now stood by, while freedom has not only been threatened, but prostrated—while the aristocracy have not only abetted, but consummated the deed, in open daylight with their own hands.—The husbandman has rested upon his scythe—the mechanic has let fall the implement of his honest toil, to listen to the story. By thousands and scores of thousands will they now come up to the rescue, in whose ears the warning words of abolitionists have heretofore been an idle tale.

Permit us to add that the well known character of the press and editor, that in this instance have fallen under the proscription ban, the universal meed of approbation, for candor, courtesy, and kindness, that has been awarded them from all parties—from opponents as well as friends, enhances in no small degree, the moral force and virtue of the demonstration that has now been made. Nothing else could so completely have dissipated the illusion hitherto floating before the vision of so many well disposed and intelligent, but misinformed men, that it must have been owing to some undue asperity of manner, some lack of sound judgment or discretion, some want of christian prudence and circumspection, on the part of those who plead for the inalienable rights of man, that they have been so often and so violently assailed, and that, too, by persons professing godliness. Henceforth, the true secret of all the ruffian-like commotion that has disturbed the nation cannot fail to be understood. It will be traced to its proper parent—SLAVERY! It will be seen that there is no mildness, or gentleness, or wisdom, that can effectually remove this monster of iniquity, without rousing all the bitterness and rage of the pit.

Above all—this last act has wound up the drama—it has matured the crisis. The half-dead prophecy of yesterday, has become history. A FREE STATE HAS FALLEN BEFORE THE JUGGERNAUT OF SLAVERY! Ohio is despoiled of her glory! The star of her liberty is trampled in the mire. The Constitution is trodden down in her own streets. Her statutes are given to the winds. Her citizens hold their possessions, and exist, and speak, at the mercy and at the discretion of THEIR SELF-MADE DICTATORS! A crisis like this, must and will be a decisive one. It must prove the grave or the cradle of freedom. Its parallel is not found in the history of our republic. The citizens of Ohio will say—and cannot avoid saying—whether they will swear fealty to their conquerors, or whether they will burst their fetters. On one side or on the other, of this question, they must speak. Their silence, if they remain silent—will speak, and speak the requiem of their liberties! But silent they cannot be!

You see, then, dear brethren, the high vantage ground upon which your enemies have placed you! You occupy a position which will be defended by every citizen of Ohio, who does not consent, himself, to become a slave! From this position you cannot be driven, but by the blow that shall drive every free citizen of Ohio along with you.—Your right to plead, in Ohio, for the slave, (and on any portion of her soil you shall choose) is a right, which, as a matter of fact, is now found to stand or fall, with the right of every citizen of Ohio to his own freedom!

On a vantage ground like this, dear brethren, we are persuaded you will not think of laying down your arms. We should wrong you by the implication that you could ever consent to do this, on any ground within the universe of God. Let us rather say, that on a ground like this, you should hasten to enlarge your borders, and strengthen your stakes. A widening field, and a glorious campaign, we doubt not, dear brethren, is before you. A post of distinguished prominence and dignity, as well as peril, is assigned to you. The fate of this nation—the destiny of posterity—the freedom of unborn millions—the fair fame of America—the hopes of a suffering world—are committed to your trust. The soil you occupy seems marked out by the God of the oppressed, as the last, final Thermopylae of holy freedom upon the earth. The glorious Emancipator of his church and of the world, has seen fit to place you in the fore front of the battle. Your brethren in tribulation are looking anxiously towards you. Their prayers on your behalf, ascend, day and night, before the DELIVERER OF THE NEEDY. The eyes of the world are upon you. A mighty cloud of unseen witnesses are hovering near you. The chosen representatives and brethren of your risen Savior—"hungry" for the bread of eternal life—"thirsty" for the living fountains of freedom—"sick" with the agonies of "hope deferred"—and "imprisoned by the fetters of oppression—stretch out, in silence, their imploring hands towards you. And look! that motto on your banner—"Inasmuch as ye did it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye did it unto me!" And, hark! that watchword—"To him that overcometh!" Onward, then! Onward! To the rescue! Quit yourselves like men, and be strong. Put on the whole armor of God, and quench all the fiery darts of the wicked. For Zion's sake, hold not your peace; and for Jerusalem's sake, rest not, until the RIGHTEOUSNESS thereof go forth as brightness; and the EMANCIPATION thereof as a lamp that burneth.

N. Y. A. S. S.

ALVAN STEWART, Chairman Ex. Com.
CHARLES STUART,
WM. GOODSELL,
JACOB SNYDER,
J. C. DELONG,
BENJAMIN GREEN,
RUBEN HOGG,
OLIVER WESTMORE,
AMOS SAVAGE,
SAMUEL LIGHTBODY,
GERRIT SMITH.

EXTRACT OF A LETTER FROM THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE KENIA ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

KENIA, Sept. 2d, 1836.
To the Executive Committee of the Ohio State Anti-Slavery Society.

Dear Brethren—We take pleasure in informing you, that the progress of anti-slavery principles in Green county. A society of 50 or 60 male, and about 30 female, members was organized on Tuesday last; and we know of many who will join us, who were not present. More than fifty dollars were subscribed in aid of the cause. A general feeling in favor of supporting the principles of free discussion, pervades the respectable part of our community. Many, who have not professed themselves abolitionists, will subscribe for the Philanthropist, if its publication is resumed. Many have proffered to contribute towards the expense of a suit against the enemies of free institutions in Cincinnati. As those, in favor of free discussion, are anxious for the publication of the Philanthropist, they will encourage it whenever published; but they would greatly prefer its publication in Cincinnati. They think that our free institutions should be defended on the very spot where they were violated.

The influence of the mob in the city, has been decided-

ly favorable to our cause in this county; and were the Philanthropist published weekly now, that outrage and the attendant circumstances could be brought to bear with powerful effect on the public mind.

JOHN WESLEY AND THE MOBS.

[The following account taken from Zion's Watchman, a Methodist Journal, is not unworthy the notice of the Mayor of this city, and the Rev. gentleman who presided at the Market House meeting. Indeed, it may be profitably read by all who are in any way concerned in the disorders of the times.]

In some remarks published in our 26th No., we took occasion to show, that John Wesley, as he now exists in the knowledge of such as have read his writings, is quite another person from the man of this name, who lived and labored in England from 1729 to 1791. When he was living, and while so earnestly engaged in his benevolent labors, he was severely denounced as a very great fanatic; he was proscribed by many of his friends—discarded and shut out of the churches; he was calumniated and persecuted, as a disturber of the peace—as scarcely fit to live. His faithful discriminations of sin, and his unyielding opposition against the prevailing and popular vices of the age in which he lived, procured for him the name of a very great agitator.

John Wesley certainly was an "agitator," of the right kind; and the opposition which showed itself against this man of God, in clubs, stones, mobs, &c., proceeded from the very same principles which has prompted the use of these means against the cause of truth at the present day. And yet, many Methodists of the present day are frightened at the thought of being encountered by a mob—nay, they suppose, that any one who may, by any means, be made the object of their malevolence, must certainly be a bad man, or, at least, a very great "fanatic;" and considering how extensively this fear now prevails, both in the membership and ministry of the Methodist Episcopal Church, we have thought it worth the time, to give some account of the mobocrats of Wesley's day, that we may see how often he quailed and shrunk from his duty, in the midst of those scenes of uproar and confusion.

The first mob, (we believe it is the first) which Wesley gives an account of, is found in his Journal under date of April 1st, 1740; and it occurred, it seems, while he was giving an account of another mob, which had been raised against the Apostle Paul! He says:—

"Some or other of the children of Belial had labored to disturb us several nights before; but now it seemed as if all the host of the aliens were come together with one consent. Not only the court and the alleys, but all the street, upward and downward, was filled with people, shouting, cursing and swearing, and ready to swallow up the ground with fierceness and rage!"

But all this tumult did not, it seems, once suggest to the mind of Wesley, that it was not expedient for him to agitate the subject of salvation by faith any more.

On the 26th of October following, he was mobbed again, near his own house; and the next January, he was beset by another, which tore down part of the house in which he was preaching. A mob surrounded him as he was preaching on Sunday, September 12th, 1742; and he continued his sermon while the blood was oozing from a wound in his forehead, which had been caused by a stone thrown at him by one of the rabble. Of another, which was raised August 6, 1742, he remarks:—

"When I had done preaching, I would have gone over to the city, to bring my rule, condemned by long years, always to look a mob in the face; but our people took us up, whether I would or no, and carried me into the house."

Wesley was present at another time, when a mob was collected to put down honest John Nelson. After they had gathered around him, and stood still a few moments, a Papist cried out to them, "Why do you not knock the dog's brains out?" and anon, they commenced pelting him with stones, bricks, &c., one of which hit him upon the head, and felled him to the ground. After a surgeon had dressed his wounds, in another place, Nelson commenced preaching again, when the mob gathered again, and one of them knocked him down, and after stamping him into the mud, they left him for dead.

July 26th, 1747, Wesley was again surrounded by a mob; and he tells us, that they fought violently with the doors and windows of the house into which he had entered; and another on the 10th of the July following; and by two more on the 25th of the following August; and by another on the 3d of the next November!

February 12th, 1748, on visiting a place called Shipton, he found a mob had been prepared, hired, and made sufficiently drunk to do all manner of mischief. In August of this year, he was again assailed by a mob, who were armed with clubs, &c.; one of them struck him in the face with his fist, and another knocked him down upon the ground. He was surrounded by another at Tremere, a few days after; and by another at Brentford, November 14th; and by another in Cork, Ireland, May 31, 1749. Another beset him at Dublin, October 16th; and another, in the evening of the same day. Here he says, the mob exceeded in rage and bitterness, all that he had ever witnessed.

The next year, May 29th, we find him at Cork, and followed by a mob which was led on by the Mayor, his agents, and the town drummer. They went to the house into which he had entered, and well nigh tore it down; they took up the floors, and burnt whatever of the wood-work they could collect, in the streets. And it should be remarked, that this—and indeed, all the mobs which were stirred up by wicked men against Mr. Wesley, were put down to his credit—he raised them, he caused the mobs and the riots!

Two days after the above date, the same mob rallied against him again, and they were up and at it between 3 and 4 o'clock in the morning. They continued to patrol the streets during the following day, abusing all that were called Methodists, and threatening to murder them, and to pull down their dwellings, in case they did not leave that way of worship.

On the 26th of May, the mob rallied the third time, led on by a clergyman; and again on the 30th.

And yet, we believe Mr. Wesley was not very seriously molested by a mob, till the 30th and 31st of September, 1753. The next one he mentions, was on April 24th 1754, when he informs us, clouds of earth and stones flew about on every side. Another is mentioned under date of October 2, same year. And two others assailed him on the 28th of March, 1753; and on the 10th of the following October, he preached at a place where a mob was provided with horns, &c., by the curate, to prevent the congregation from hearing him.

Numerous other mobs are mentioned by Mr. Wesley in his journals, but the foregoing account must be sufficient to satisfy our readers that, in one respect at least, Wesley was distinguished above every other man who has ever lived; he was certainly a very great agitator—he kept the people in one continued commotion; and, in many places, an appointment for him to preach was considered but a signal for the gathering of a mob. Nor were those mobs always composed of the baser sort as they were not unfrequently headed by "gentlemen of property and standing," by curates, by constables, by mayors, and even by professed ministers of the gospel!

We have not thought it proper to go into a particular account of all that took place at the time of the mobs here referred to, nor of Mr. Wesley's presence of mind and christian conduct on those occasions. One or two incidents, however, may be mentioned.

His habit of "always looking a mob in the face," is worthy of remark. He tells us that this was generally the best way to disperse it.

On one occasion, while he was preaching, one came to him, and entreated him to desist, as the mob were about to tear the house down over his head. "No," said Wesley; "I'll make the best use of the hour while it stands;" and so continued his sermon, till prevented by the mob. (One reason assigned by no abolitionist should be suffered to preach in any of their churches, was the fear that, if they did so, the churches would be mobbed!)

But from what has been, we learn that the opposition and rage of mobs against a cause, (while it is not by such means proved to be necessarily good,) do not demonstrate, either that the cause is a bad one, or that its advocates are "Jacobinical, hot-headed fanatics."

FRUITS OF NEGRO EMANCIPATION.—The results of negro emancipation, upon the products of the British West India Islands, is exciting much surprise in England and America. An English journal gives a comparative statement of the products exported from Demarara and Berbice during the first quarter of the present and the first quarter of the three preceding years, which shows an increase in favor of free labor, of 51 per cent. on sugar, molasses, rum and cotton, and of 100 per cent. on coffee. It is stated, also, that the plantations are more easily and less expensively managed; and that the lands now command, on mortgage, more money than could be obtained before the passage of the emancipation bill.—*Edin. Rev. Jour.*

CINCINNATI, SEPTEMBER 30, 1836.

Methodist Doctrines on Slavery.

We wish to call the attention of our Methodist readers particularly, to an article below, copied from the Pittsburgh Conference Journal of last December, which professes to exhibit the doctrines of the M. E. Church on the subject of slavery. The exhibition reveals a singular harmony of sentiment between Methodism and abolitionism, on certain points of vital importance.

According to Mr. Elliott's interpretation, it will be seen that the Methodist doctrine concerning the moral character of slavery, is identical with the doctrine that lies at the foundation of the whole scheme of abolition. We understand it to affirm, that slavery is "a sin," "a great sin," "one of the greatest sins," and to repudiate the idea that it is a merely "natural, civil, or political evil." Now this is precisely the doctrine, which distinguishes abolitionism. Nor has any abolitionist ever given greater prominence to it, than has Methodism, unexplained by Mr. Elliott.

Here, then, is a ground, and a most important one, too, on which Methodism and "modern abolitionism" must meet together.

It will be further seen that to a certain extent, the Methodist Episcopal Church has upheld the principle of "immediate emancipation." To those who have heard her in General Conference denouncing abolitionism by a solemn, unqualified resolution, our assertion may seem strange. But it is no less true than strange. Her Discipline demands in fact, that all her leaders, stewards, trustees, exhorters, deacons, elders and bishops, shall be "immediate emancipationists." If we are mistaken, so is Mr. Elliott, so indeed is the Discipline itself. Read the article on which we are commenting. Look at the first and second answers to the question, "What shall be done for the extinction of slavery?" Do you not see that she enjoins upon any travelling preacher, who may become an owner of a slave or slaves by any means, to execute, if it be practicable, a legal emancipation of his slaves, on pain of forfeiting his ministerial character? Do you not see that no slaveholder shall be eligible to any official station in the church, where the laws of the state, wherein he lives, will allow emancipation and protect the freedman in the possession of his liberty? This is "immediate emancipation," so far as it goes. The fair inference from it, is, that where there were no laws against emancipation in any of the states, there would be an immediate emancipation of all slaves held by official men or candidates for office, in the M. E. Church. The rules, doubtless, are defective, in not enjoining such a duty on private, as well as public members. Mr. Winans, a member of the General Conference, well observed, that the same conduct which should exclude a man from office, should exclude him from membership in the church. They are also defective, because they do not provide how an individual shall act, where a writing of manumission cannot be legally executed. That the spirit of the rules can permit a master under such a disability, quietly to retain his bondmen, is hardly to be supposed. For, if the views of Mr. Elliott be correct, the church regards slavery as a sin, and upon this belief, the rules were of course devised.

Now we should pay but a poor compliment to their framers, to attribute to them the belief, that any law forbidding the abandonment of a sin, should make that sin, venial. What, then, does the spirit of these regulations require? First; that a real, though not legal emancipation, should in every such case take place; and second; that persons, trammelled in the performances of their duty by laws against emancipation, should unite in endeavoring, by the most efficient means, to procure their repeal.

The rules, defective as they are, reveal a sort of consciousness in this church, that the belief in the sinfulness of slavery inevitably involves as a duty, its immediate abandonment. Alas! that this consciousness should not have been more vivid and effective.

All the world knows the simplicity of abolitionism, no soon as it recognizes the principle, that slavery is sin. It is a simplicity, we believe, which belongs to our holy religion. They are simple enough to infer, that if slavery be "a sin," "a great sin," "one of the greatest sins," the duty of every individual committing it, is, to cease from it entirely and at once. This inference, they suppose, requires no extrinsic support. It is inevitable from the very nature of the doctrine from which it is drawn. In this mode of reasoning, they are sustained by the example of the Methodist church, as well as that of all other churches, in every instance of immorality, except slavery. Fornication is a sin; drunkenness is a sin; lying is a sin; Sabbath-breaking is a sin; profane swearing is a sin. He, who is guilty of one or all, should repent and reform—but when? Now, is the response of every christian of whatever name. "But, if I become sober immediately, my natural forces will fail me, and I shall sink with debility." No matter: do your duty; and if you sink, still you are safe. "If I give up my distillery at once, my wife and children will be beggared, and I shall become the derision of all men." Never mind! Better consent unto poverty than wickedness—better be the laughing-stock of fools, than the scorn of the Almighty. "But if my lie save my neighbor from starvation, or my own life from the destroyer." Deceive not yourself. Disobedience is no fulfilment of the law of love; and he that would save his life shall lose it. Such would be the answer of every true christian to whatever objections might be started by the weak, the timid, the selfish. Christianity recognizes no prospective penitence, no reformation "at a more convenient season," no expediency that can sanctify departure from duty.

The Methodist Episcopal Church has hitherto been distinguished by the peculiar emphasis she has laid upon this principle. Abolitionism has at no time been more fairly chargeable with ultraism, than has Methodism, occasionally, in its exemplifications of this principle. Freely has her approbation been given to the little boy, who, at the risk of his father's displeasure, would steal away to the house of God; to the servant, who would bend his knee before the Almighty, in the face of his master's mandate; to the wife, who, in direct opposition to the express will of her husband, has gone forth to the house of prayer or feast of love, and thus obeyed what she considered the voice of conscience. It was the custom of John Wesley to move forward in his course, filling all his appointments and proclaiming the whole truth, whether they would hear or rage; undeterred by the persuasion of friends, unsolicitous about his safety or comfort, unmoved by the insolence of mobs or the menaces of lawless magistrates. Few of his primitive followers ever yielded one inch of the way, or turned aside a hair's breadth, because violence lifted its voice against them, and the children of the Devil swore destruction. Such conduct we all admire. It is clothed with the majesty of christian heroism; it displays a divine magnanimity. The church which has exhibited so many bright examples of christian courage and self-devotion, has reason to glory that the spirit of her founders was a spirit of martyrdom. To this day, will her members shed tears over the sufferings, privations and persecutions of their fathers

—when they read how they were ridiculed, defamed, beaten, stoned, spit upon and haltered, because they dared to proclaim every where and at all times, the unsearchable riches of Christ. The same spirit passed over the Atlantic. With a simplicity and heroism, worthy of all praise, the first Methodists in this country lifted up their voices against slavery, as against every other sin. They believed it to be sin—how, then, could they be silent? They warred against wickedness, wherever and under whatever aspect found. The result was, what might have been expected. Some were convicted, and turned away from them; many were offended, and persecution followed. Persecution triumphed. Men, who had previously counted not their own lives dear, so they might preach truth, began to adopt a different principle. They kept back part of the truth, that they might incite the rest. Do I misrepresent? Consider the case. Hitherto they had been convinced of the sinfulness of slavery, and as a sin had denounced it. Persecution arose. Their usefulness was apparently curtailed. Access to the negroes was denied them. Laws forbidding emancipation, were enacted. They were frowned down by universal suspicion. These were perplexing and gloomy circumstances; but was there anything in them to demonstrate that slavery was not sin? Then should John Wesley have conceded, that the apathy and infidelity of the Church of England on the doctrine of the new birth, were no sin, because his proclamation of the truth brought upon him slander and abuse, and excluded him from the churches of that establishment. These persecuted men did not change, could not rightfully have changed their opinions of the moral character of slavery, because they were persecuted. It should have been, indeed, an additional evidence of the truth of their testimony against this sin; for they that "live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution." Again we find them preaching, but behold the change! Slavery, they would not touch; its sinfulness was no longer a theme; the doctrine of non-interference was adopted. And men began to consider that Methodists themselves were slaveholders; why, then, suspect them? What is the inference? Their good men mistook the path of duty, and a most fatal mistake it was, for it has filled their church with slaveholders, and made it a most formidable pro-slavery champion. They conferred somewhat with flesh and blood, and then came in expediency under the guise of enlarged benevolence, and whispered, they had better be silent on this vexed and vexatious question, and then they could again have free access to the soul of the poor slave. This was all plausible, and so was mistaken for the course of truth. Herein we believe was a lamentable dereliction of principle.

In view of many of the facts we have just noticed, we find no reason to wonder, that Mr. Elliott should feel himself warranted in using such language as the following:—"We are, however, at something of a loss to account for two things in the conduct of our southern brethren." After noticing one point, he then proceeds—"The other point is their condemning the principles of abolitionists in such a way as to condemn the principles of our own common Discipline." And again—"It is to us a matter of downright surprise, that our brethren have so far overlooked the sin and effects of their slave system, as to suppose that it would be either safe or permanent, had not some northern fanatics (as they are determined to call Methodists in principle on the subject of slavery) interfered," &c. And again—"We would just add that it is an entire mistake in our brethren of the south to charge with enthusiasm and fanaticism the sober principles of Methodism; and this is done to a great extent in the outcry against abolitionists." Thus he admits, that Methodism and abolitionism have certain principles in common—that abolitionists hold some of the "sober principles of Methodism"—that abolitionists ("northern fanatics") are in fact "Methodists in principle on the subject of slavery."

We have explained what these principles are. Methodism and "modern abolitionism" hold in common that slavery is "a sin," "a great sin," "one of the greatest sins." Mr. Elliott is our authority. Methodism enjoins immediate emancipation to a certain extent. Modern abolitionism follows out the principle, which gave birth to this injunction, to its legitimate extent, and so enjoins immediate emancipation upon all slaveholders.

We beg candid Methodists to keep in mind these doctrines on the subject of slavery, professedly held by their church, while their attention is for a moment directed to the following facts:—

All that portion of your church which dwells in the slaveholding states, believe that slavery is not a sin, but at most a necessary evil.

A large portion of your southern ministry, and official as well as private members, are slaveholders.

In your recent General Conference, the doctrine was publicly maintained by some of the most distinguished members, that it was not only excusable, but expedient for ministers, nay bishops, to be slaveholders.

The majority of your northern preachers as well as members, concede that slavery is not a sin, but at most a necessary evil.

Mr. Elliott, in relation to information gained at the recent session of your Conference, says—"Nevertheless it appeared, so far as disciplinary regulations are concerned in practice, that they are but a dead letter south of the Kentucky and Baltimore Conferences." He says, in connection with this, "The principles of our Discipline on slavery, were acknowledged and maintained on all hands." It is for candid Methodists to judge how fully "acknowledged and maintained on all hands" are the principles of their Discipline on slavery, when the regulations made to exemplify and enforce these principles are in practice, in all the southern Conferences, save Baltimore and Kentucky, "but a dead letter."

At your General Conference in 1836, the following resolution was passed, only fourteen in the negative—Mr. Elliott, the bold assenter of the identity of Methodism and abolitionism on the subject of slavery, voting for it.

"Resolved, By the delegates of the Annual Conferences in General Conference assembled, that they are decidedly opposed to modern abolitionism." Here is no mincing the matter. They define not; they discriminate not. "Modern abolitionism," as a whole, of course in all its parts, is denounced. So careful were they to be understood, as entire in their opposition to this system of doctrine, that they rejected by an overwhelming vote, the following guarding amendment, in the very language of your Discipline—Mr. Elliott, voting again with the majority:—

"Resolved, &c., That we are as much as ever, convinced of the great evil of slavery." Precisely where there should have been a guard against mis-interpretation, there we see none, and of course are bound to infer that you are not, "as much as ever convinced of the great evil of slavery."

Your General Conference continually refused to express formally any opinion against slavery. When a member from Maine proposed an amendment to the Pastoral Address, in the very words of the Discipline, which recognized slavery as "an evil," your representatives rejected it by a majority so large, that the vote was not counted.

Your General Conference then in 1836 have condemned abolitionism in such a way, as to condemn the prin-

ciples of your common Discipline; and, what may be noted in passing, as a minor consideration, the Rev. Charles Elliott in May, 1836, against voted abolitionism in such a way as inevitably to condemn the principles which he had avowed, as a Methodist, in Dec. 1835. His inconsistency may not seem wonderful, but when shall we cease to wonder at the vote and conduct of your Conference, which goes to the entire subversion of all your long-established and openly avowed principles on the subject of slavery.

To candid Methodists we have addressed ourselves.—To them we appeal for the truth of our allegations. It remains yet to be seen whether they are willing to uphold a General Conference in its direct opposition to the spirit and letter of their own discipline; whether they are willing to unite with it in anathematizing a class of men, who are advocating the principles and displaying the self-sacrificing spirit, which distinguished the primitive father of their church. We hope not.

From the Beginning it has been Thus.

Speaking and printing are but modes, in which are exercised the right of the individual to promulgate his opinions or doctrines.

From the beginning, men have waged war against the free exercise of this right. Christ was opposed, persecuted, slandered, mocked, murdered, because he would exercise this right. "Did not we command you, that ye should not teach in this name?" said the sanhedrim to Peter and John, those fearless champions of the truth. The first christians were persecuted; they were burnt; they were sawn asunder; they were thrown to wild beasts; they were crucified, because they refused to surrender this right. The curse of a corrupt world flamed against Luther, because he nobly dared to unmask and proclaim the scandalous vices and deformities of a degenerate church.

Abolitionists in Great Britain have been persecuted, and in the United States set upon by mobs, and threatened by truckling law-makers, for the bold use of this right.—Last of all, Cincinnati mob-men have most fiercely assailed the rights, and invaded the homes, and sought to commit violence on the persons, of peaceable men, who, under the banner of the constitution, whilst their enemies were using their liberty of speech and of the press in opposing law, and inflaming the spirit of evil, exercised the same liberty in maintaining the supremacy of the laws, and advocating the full application of those principles, in the partial application of which our self complacent nation is perpetually glorying.

Mobocrat.

Listen, violent man, to the voice of reason, and no longer give heed to the father of lies. You are resolved to stab the liberty of the press, and tread our rights in the dust. What is your object? Listen one moment! You either fear conviction, or you do not, or you are apprehensive lest the sentiments of others should be changed by the operations of your press.

Perhaps you fear conviction, and therefore meditate this violence. What! are you prepared to confess that you love a lie more than the truth? to act the part of a madman who would extinguish the sun, lest he should see? Remember the words of him that made you—"this is the condemnation, that light has come into the world, and men love darkness rather than light."

Or you are fearless of conviction? Why then demolish what cannot touch you? Look at your conduct! You set your face against the constitution; you smite law from her seat; you say to justice, begone! You select darkness for your foul deed; and with hands stained with filthy lucre, pull down the palladium of our safety and your safety! and for what? Foot should be engraven on your front; for you have perpetrated a black crime for no end!

But you are apprehensive of a change in the sentiments of others, and therefore would destroy the agent that may work it. Behold the tyrant! he is in arms, because he guesses, if people become enlightened, his gains at the end of the year may fall short a few dollars! He is in arms, and tells some thirty thousands of his fellow citizens they shall not read what that press prints, for he will lose money. He installs himself as censor; what he pleases they may read; what he bans, let them touch not.

Free, noble-minded, christian citizens, will you suffer your constitution and your laws, the bulwarks of your safety, to be sapped and subverted by the love of money?

Infatuation.

The free discussion of slavery, is the head and front of our offending. It is for this our presses must be demolished, and our lives menaced. It is for this our names are to be cast out as evil, and our presence "avoided as if we were rattlesnakes."

In what light would such persecution appear if we were a political party? We will suppose ourselves to constitute such a party. The abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia shall be our object; and a part of our plan shall be, to sustain no candidate for Congress who will not vote for this measure, and no slave-holder as a candidate for the Presidency. The free discussion of slavery in the supposed case, would be entirely necessary to our operations; and our doctrines and measures would be what they now are. Would any one then have the hardihood to assert that, as politicians, we had no right to promulgate our policy, or by the press, our peculiar opinions? What! crush by violence a political party, because its sentiments might happen to be unpopular—to be deemed by the many as injurious to the interests of community?

Let us bring the matter home. The whigs profess to believe that the republican party has injured the political welfare and moral character of the nation; that their doctrines and doings are calculated to paralyze, if not prostrate our political institutions. What then hinders them from dictating to a party, which they suppose so dangerous to the republic, desistance, immediate and total, from all its operations? Will not the paramount principle of self preservation warrant them in compelling desistance? Certainly, if both parties, on this principle may forcibly put down abolitionists. What hinders then? They have not the power! Has it come to this? Then let the good people of these United States know, that right is the child of power—that no sect, no party amongst them stands, save by fear or favor.

The Difference.

The noble conduct of our revolutionary fore-fathers is adduced, to justify the deeds of a licentious mob. Ye profaners of the ashes of the dead, can you not see the difference? The rights of a whole nation were then severely invaded. No redress could be had before any tribunal. And even when redressing themselves, they aimed no blow at the freedom of speech or of the press. They simply set aside laws, which were the offspring of artificial relations, for the sake of maintaining unimpaired, rights which had from the beginning been acknowledged by the invader.

What is your conduct, ye law-contemners? You fancy evil may happen from our lawful acts, and forthwith strike at our rights—rights which we have never ceded, and could not cede; rights bestowed by a charter you dare not question, a charter from God to every individual man; rights, not created by social relations, not the offspring of the social compact, although solemnly recognized, and emphatically secured by our Federal and state constitutions—the rights of speech and of the press.

These rights you would annihilate, and how? By legal process? No! Law makes no provision for so foul an act.—But by violence—naked, brute violence. And why? Because we have invaded your rights? No! Violated any law? No! Why then, I ask. Because the peaceable and lawful exertions of our rights may lessen by a little the pecuniary gains of a few capitalists and merchants.

If American citizens are prepared to wink at this outrage, then let the world know, that money is the American's God, and that for the love of gain, he will rob his brother.

The Peace of the City requires it.

If for the sake of peace to the city, abolitionists should yield their right of publishing in their paper; how long, ere they would be required for the same reason, to stop its circulation? and then how long before they must cease to speak of abolition? The mob is like the grave, never satisfied. "Give! give!" is its cry. It is like the "fire that saith not, it is enough." When kindled but a little, it should be quenched, else will it gather a desolating power that nothing can stay.

"The peace of the city requires it!" The peace of the city requires that illegal violence be met and resisted on the first onset. The peace of the city stands not in the tame concession, but in the firm maintenance of guaranteed rights. The peace of the city demands of every freeman, when unlawfully assailed, that he should stand up under the broad shadow of the constitution, and prefer death to crouching.

The mob in Cincinnati are rebels against the people of this state. The people have declared solemnly and explicitly in their constitution, that every citizen has an indisputable right to speak, write, or print upon any subject as he thinks proper." The Cincinnati mob have not only disputed this right, but by overt, high-handed violence, attempted to bar its exercise. Shall we then, by basely yielding to this violence, sanction their rebel acts? No! we yield not. The peace of the city, the honor of the state requires that we should disregard the menaces of a few hundred law-breakers, and confide in the declaration—the express declaration of nine hundred thousand freemen.—We shall abide by our principles, and if, while laying hold of the very horns of our constitution, we be beaten down and destroyed, then let every wind of heaven proclaim, that Ohio has lied to her own children, and stands convicted of perjury in the eyes of the world.

SLAVEHOLDER'S BILL OF FARE.

The (Petersburg) Intelligence, an extensive and approved caterer for the public taste of the "OLD DOMINION," serves up the following dishes for the 1st day of this month (Sep.)

[RACES FOR MONEY.]

Norfolk and Portsmouth Jockey Club.

FALL MEETING, 1836.

Will commence over the Norfolk and Portsmouth course on the third Monday in September, and continue five days.

FIRST DAY'S RACE.

A Sweepstake for colts and fillies, 3 years old spring of 1836, 2 mile heats, \$100 entrance, half forfeit, five subscribers, and closed 20th inst.

- 1 Col. James M. Selden, of Balt. names c c by Sussex, out of the dam of Nelly Webb.
- 2 Y. N. Oliver, Esq., of Washington city.
- 3 Messrs. Watts and Portlock, name b f by Timoleon, dam by Reputation.
- 4 Mr. James B. Kendall, of Baltimore, names b c by Henry, dam by Eclipse.
- 5 James S. Garrison, names b f Virginia Fairfield, b f Timoleon, dam by Virginia.

Second Race—Same Day.

A Silver Plate, valued at 500 dollars, two mile heats—the entrance money depending on the number of subscribers; the winner to take the plate or the stake at his option.

SECOND DAY—FIRST RACE.

Proprietor's Purse, 300 dollars, 2 mile heats, entrance 15 dollars.

Second Race—Same Day.

A Sweepstake for colts and fillies, 3 years old, 2 mile heats, \$300 entrance, \$100 forfeit, to tame and close 10th September, four or more to make a race. Entries to be addressed to the Proprietor, Norfolk.

THIRD DAY.

Ladies' Club Purse, 400 dollars, three mile heats, entrance 20 dollars.

FOURTH DAY.

Jockey Club Purse, 700 dollars, four mile heats, entrance 20 dollars.

FIFTH DAY.

Proprietor's Purse, 100 dollars, mile heats, best three in five, entrance 10 dollars.

The above Purse are without discount, and free for any horse, mare or gelding. The Proprietor will have in readiness, at the Steam Boat wharf, wagons and carts to carry the baggage of all race horses to the course, free of charge by giving him due notice of the day each stud is expected to arrive in the steam boats and return the same. The course has been newly fitted up and will be in fine order. The Proprietor has no hesitation in saying the fixtures of the course for convenience for the members and race horses, are not surpassed by any in the United States. The Purse, in the amount, are larger than any other course in Virginia, and equalled to any other now established. The Proprietor has fitted up a part of the Pavilion for the accommodation of ladies. He hopes to have it well filled by their presence, whom he particularly invites. The rules of the course will be rigidly enforced.

JAMES S. GARRISON, Proprietor.

There are three gentlemen north of the Potomac who have entered for the first prize who will bring with them three fine studs, and other stable effects from the north, to meet Old Virginia on her own soil. The Proprietor will give them a hearty welcome and a fair field, with a general invitation to owners of all the training stables in the United States, from the large number of fine horses now training. The Proprietor anticipates a visit from the Napoleon of the turf, Col. Wm. R. Johnson, and his noble stud, with a host of brave competitors, Capt. John Heath, O. P. Hare, Richard Adams, Isham Pucket, Wm. Williamson, John M. Botts, Dr. George Goodwyn, Major Doswell, Heer Davis, P. Hare, and Wm. L. White, Esq., to meet their northern friends to contend for the prizes to be run for over the Norfolk and Portsmouth course, Fall Meeting, 1836.

J. S. G.

[RACES FOR LIBERTY.]

Stop the Runaways!

Runaway from the subscriber, living 14 miles north of Raleigh, on Friday night the 13th instant, his negro boy ABRAHAM and his wife GRACE. The man is 27 years of age, about 6 feet high, well proportioned, with tolerably thick lips, and the woman is about 36—the former not very dark complexioned—the latter, tall, thin visaged, and quite dark. Abraham had no marks that I recollect of, save that on the day of the election he got into a fight at Raleigh, and received a severe blow over the left eye, the effects of which will probably remain some time. He is remarkable, too, for a bold, impudent, and swaggering air, which will attract the attention of every one. The woman, if examined, cannot fail to lead to her being identified. They will aim for Petersburg, I think, the boy having been for years engaged in the waggoning business to and from that place.

I will give Fifty Dollars reward for the apprehension of Abraham, and Ten Dollars for his wife, if taken in the state, or double that amount, if taken out of the state.

DAVID GILL.

Wake county, August 22.

Twenty Dollars Reward!

I will give the above reward of twenty dollars, for my two negro men, Douglas and Billy; both have black skins, but Billy is a shade the darker. They are both of good form, and I suppose about 5 feet 10 inches in height; Douglas, I think, is something the tallest; their ages are un-

known to me, as I did not raise them, but will say, that they are from thirty to thirty-five years old: no particular recollection, unless Douglas has one of his legs or thighs, occasioned from the bite of a dog some time last year, which I never have seen, in consequence of his living at an off plantation. Douglas went off on the fourth day of July last, Billy on the first day of the present month (August), neither had they any just cause for going away, as I am informed by my overseer. Consequently I am induced to think that they will try to get off at a distance, and perhaps put me to much trouble. I will give the above reward for both if taken within the state, or ten dollars for either. If taken out of the state, and delivered to me, or secured so that I get them again, I will pay all that is right and reasonable. I have not been able to trace the direction the above named negroes have taken; but it is possible that they may be lurking about a plantation, formerly owned by me, near the Petersburg Rail Road, now owned by Dr. George Field, where they lived for some ten years, and where they have many acquaintances.

FIELDING ROSE.

Sussex, Aug. 25.

From the Friend of Man.
Progress of Light.

The truth cannot always be smothered. The presses that have been crying out against the reckless imprudence of immediate emancipation, are obliged at last, however reluctantly, to register the folly and falsity of their own predictions. Look at the following:—

West India Emancipation.—The English papers contain the returns of exports from some of their West India Islands, which exhibit a considerable increase, instead of the diminution which was feared, in their products. It is the opinion of many of the most intelligent persons interested in West India property, that the negroes are quite as valuable to them as they were while held as slaves, and that the indemnity money they received was CLEAR GAIN. —*Jour. of Com.*

What will the prophets of idleness, poverty, starvation, and blood, as the result of emancipation, say to this? An increase of exports, and the indemnity money clear gain! Will our southern friends open their eyes to this fact—admitted such, by all parties!—*Ed. of Emancipator.*

Abolitionists have long been telling the laboring people of the north, that the anti-abolitionist aristocracy are ready to join in the southern project of enslaving them. By the tone of the following article from the New York Evening Post, it would seem that the process is already commenced:—

Equal Justice.—The contrast between the proceedings of the Court of Oyer and Terminer, in the late murder case, and in the case of the mechanics that "would not work," shocks the moral sense of the whole land. Assassins, the most desperate and malignant that ever ravaged a civilized community, are caught for a moment in the flimsy meshes of the law, and are then let go again, that the world may stand amazed at the magnanimity of Justice. But if a dozen journeymen refuse to sell their labor for the prices that are offered to them, "the magnanimity of Justice" goes to sleep, and a cruel penalty is enforced, which is carefully withheld from the honored heads of the heroes of the hatchet and the dagger. Be the cause of it what it may, the fact stares us in the face, that at this moment in the city of New York, the bully and the murderer go free while the laborer who will not work as he is bid, is harassed by an unrelenting persecution, and sternly menaced with "a distress infinite" on the means whereby he lives.

Zion's Watchman.

At a meeting of the Executive Committee of the New York Wesleyan Society, held August 26th, 1836, the following preamble and resolutions were unanimously adopted, and ordered to be published:—

Whereas, It has come to the knowledge of this committee, that repeated attempts have been made to retard the circulation of Zion's Watchman among the ministers and members of the Methodist Episcopal Church; And

Whereas, The proprietors of this paper are members of the Methodist E. Church, and firmly attached to its discipline and doctrines; And

Whereas, Zion's Watchman is edited by a regular member of one of the Annual Conferences, and devoted to the interests of the church aforesaid; and it differs from no other Methodist paper in this country, except so far as it is open to the discussion of questions which are not discussed in our regular official paper—and so far, also, as a liberality of sentiment, and other circumstances, may serve to render it paramount in its claims to public patronage; Therefore,

Resolved, 1. That we view with alarm, the repeated attempts which have been made by certain members of the New York Annual Conference, to prevent the circulation of Zion's Watchman among the ministers and members of the Methodist E. Church.

Resolved, 2. That we cannot but consider these attempts as aimed at the freedom of speech and of the press, and against one of the dearest principles of Protestant christianity.

Resolved, 3. That these attempts are peculiarly wanting in magnanimity and fairness, inasmuch as the Christian Advocate and Journal, (the medium through which they have been made,) has, from the beginning, repeatedly refused to publish any thing, and all that those whom it has censured, have felt it a duty to say in explanation or self-defence. Nay, more; it has for two years past, published numerous articles on one side of a controverted subject, in which the whole christian community are deeply interested, and at the same time, it has refused to publish any thing on the other side, even when it had censured and condemned many of our ministers, not excepting, even, two Annual Conferences of the Methodist E. Church.

Resolved, 4. That we have the fullest confidence in the piety, talents, and moral worth of the Rev. LA ROY SENDERLAND, the editor of said Watchman, who, by his zealous labors in the ministry for many years, and by his services already rendered in editing this paper, has established a claim to the confidence of the religious public, not to be destroyed by the persecutions directed against him.

Resolved, 5. That we are more than ever convinced of the necessity of such a paper as Zion's Watchman—as, in our opinion, or its success depends in a great degree, the purity, honor, and prosperity of the Methodist E. Church; and we do, therefore, hereby pledge ourselves anew to the labors and sacrifices necessary for its support.

Resolved, 6. That, struggling as we are for the maintenance of great moral principles, which concern the rights and peace of all christian people, in every church, we look with confidence for countenance and support from a liberal christian public.

Resolved, 7. That the editors of papers which exchange with the Watchman be, and they are hereby, respectfully requested to give the foregoing preamble and resolutions a place in their papers, respectively.

JAMES W. BARKER, Secretary.

N. B. Zion's Watchman is published weekly at 96 Nassau street, New York, by the Executive Committee of the New York Wesleyan Society. Terms, \$2 per year, in advance.

EMANCIPATION.—We have been astonished at an exposition of the amount of produce exported from Georgetown and Berbice, British West India ports, since the emancipation of the slaves, as compared with correspondent seasons previous to that event. The produce is sugar, rum, molasses and coffee, and the increase on the whole is 50 per cent.

The statements are taken from the Standard, an English journal, which predicted nothing but ruin to the planters from the abolition of slavery.

The hundred million indemnity thus appears to have been a compensation of a novel kind, a compensation for being made richer.—*Phil. U. S. Cos.*

POETRY.

From the Herald of Freedom.

The following, altered from "Watchman tell us of the night," was sung at the celebration of the Dunbar (N. H.) Anti-Slavery Society, on the 4th of July:

Freeman—Tell us of the night—what its signs of promise are?
Bondman—Lo Brittan's light, freedom's glory beaming star.

Freeman—Do its blessed rays promise good to slave like me?
Bondman—Yes its glorious blaze lights your path to liberty.

Freeman—Tell us of the night—does the star approach our land?
Bondman—Mark yon dawning light. Lo! the breaking day at hand!

Freeman—Can those beams alone, loose the bands of wickedness?
Bondman—God is on the throne, HE will bring thee quick release.

Freeman—Tell us of the night—does that blessed morning dawn?
Bondman—Darkness takes its flight; doubt and terror are withdrawn.

Freeman—Shall our bondage cease? we in darkness cease to roam?
Bondman—Lo, the Prince of Peace! Hallelujah, come Lord, come!

The Capacity of the Colored Race.

Extracted from Rev. Dr. Griffin's Sermon.
There are many Africans who have discovered marks of genius and an elevated character sufficient to redeem the race from the charge which I am now considering. There would have been many more had circumstances favored.

"Full many a gem of purest ray serene,
The dark unfathomed caves of ocean bear,
Full many a flower is born to blush unseen,
And waste its sweetness on the desert air."

"In all countries," says Gregoire, "genius is a spark concealed in the bosom of a flint, which bursts forth at the stroke of the steel." Passing by many ancient Ethiopians to whom I have only seen a reference, and some instances of energy and prowess in the field. I have arranged the names of more than fifty negroes and mulattos which are worthy to be preserved from oblivion. Among these I could show you a handsome portrait painter, a distinguished physician, skilful navigators, and useful ministers of religion. I could show you those who could repeat from memory the koran, and those who, without rules or figures, could perform the most difficult calculations with the rapidity of thought. I could show you those who were skilled in Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, and an instance or two I might add, Arabic and Chaldaic. I could show you teachers of the Latin language, a teacher of the mathematics, and a publisher of almanacs. I could show you poets, authors of letters, histories, memoirs, essays, petitions to legislative bodies, and Latin verses and dissertations. I could show you a man of great wisdom and profound knowledge, several who were truly learned, and one who gave private lectures on philosophy at a university. I could show you members of the universities of Cambridge, Leyden, and Wittemberg. I could show you one who took the degree of doctor of philosophy, and was raised to the chair of a professor, in one of the first universities of Europe; another who was a corresponding member of the French Academy of sciences; and a third who was an associate of the National Institute of France. I could show you one who for many ages has been surnamed in Arabia the *Wise*, and whose authority Mahomet himself frequently appealed to in the koran in support of his own opinions. I could show you men of wealth and active benevolence: here a sable Howard spending his life in visiting prisons, to relieve and reclaim the wretched tenants, and consecrating all his property to charitable uses; there another founding a hospital for poor negroes and mulattos, and devoting his life and fortune to their comfort for more than forty years; in another place a third, making distant and expensive voyages to promote the improvement of his brethren and the colonization of Africa. I could show you those who, with distinguished talents and reputation, have signalized themselves in the cabinet and in the field; who have been officers of artillery in the different armies of Europe, generals in St. Domingo, lieutenants in the Russian service, and one who rose to the rank of general of division in the armies of France. I could show you, on one island, the president of a free republic, and the king of an independent nation, who have burst their way to liberty by their own vigor."

Besides these particular cases I will lay before you some general testimonies. The ordination of negroes to the sacred office is among the Spaniards, and still more among the Portuguese, as common occurrence. The history of Congo gives an account of a black bishop who studied at Rome. The son of a king, and many young people of quality, of the same country, sent into Portugal in the time of king Immanuel, were distinguished at the universities, and many of them were promoted to the priesthood. For more than a century a catholic negro clergy have existed in the isles of Cape Verde. "Several negroes," says a resident in Portugal, "have been learned lawyers, preachers and professors; and at Lisbon, Rio-Janeiro, and other Portuguese possessions, have been signalized by their talents." "Michael the elder told me," says Gregoire, "that he had seen them in different parts of the Persian Gulf, heads of great commercial houses, receiving orders and expediting vessels to all parts of the Indian coast."

The revolution of St. Domingo has formed a new epoch in the history of the African race. "The spasms of infuriated man" struggling for liberty, have seldom been more violent. We have nothing to do with the moral features exhibited in the contest; but let those who doubt the energy of the African character, pass over those encircled fields, or perched on some cliff, contemplate a republic and a kingdom of independent negroes, completely organized, cultivating the arts of peace, pursuing commerce, establishing schools and churches, and with a vigor scarcely surpassed in the French revolution, rising up to a standing among the enlightened and polished nations of Europe and America.

The capacity of the blacks has been fairly tested in the schools which have been established for their use. "Wilberforce, in conjunction with many members of the society occupied with the education of Africans, has established for them a kind of college at Clapham, which is about four leagues distant from London. The first placed there were twenty-one young negroes sent by the governor of Sierra Leone. I visited the establishment in 1802," says Gregoire, "to examine the progress of the scholars; and I found that between them and European children there existed no difference but that of color."

In the college of La Marche at Paris, a number of young Africans have been receiving an education. Their progress has been examined by many of the National Institute, and the result is the same as that obtained at Clapham. A few years ago an African school at Boston, consisting of 400 children, was examined by the French consul at that place, and the result was still the same. The venerable Anthony Benetot some years ago established a considerable portion of his time to the instruction of the blacks. This man, who had the best opportunity of judging, constantly and solemnly affirmed that he

could never find any difference between them and other people; that they were as capable of reasoning, and of making the highest attainments, and needed nothing but cultivation to afford specimens of the finest productions.—*New England Spectator.*

The Constitution and Slavery.

The Northern and Southern aristocracy are anxious to make the people believe that the Constitution of the United States has guaranteed and sanctioned slavery! This is a new doctrine. By the following, it will be seen that one of our oldest and ablest statesmen does not admit that the Constitution even recognizes the existence of slavery.

Extract from the speech of J. Q. Adams, on the admission of Arkansas into the Union.

"That instrument, contains in four different places arrangements having reference to slavery, does not, in any of them, recognize the existence of slavery or of slaves; neither of the words is to be found throughout the Constitution. Its founders were unwilling that the frame of government, ordained expressly by the People, to secure to themselves and to their posterity the blessings of liberty should be polluted even by the name of slavery. Thus when the provided that the slaveholders should enjoy that most extraordinary privilege of representation of the persons of their slaves in this Hall they adopted a circumlocution, and after enumerating free persons, those bound to service for a term of years, and Indians not taxed, including every description of human beings, slaves alone excepted, then endowed their masters with the right of representation for three-fifths of 'all other persons.'"

Thus, in the ninth section of the first article, which denied to Congress the power, prior to 1808, of prohibiting the slave-trade, that detestable traffic was described, not by its proper name, but under the gentle denomination of "the emigration or importation of such persons as any of the States now existing shall think proper to admit."

Again: The second section of the fourth article, which stipulates for the arrest and delivery up of fugitive slaves, does not name them as such. It says: "No person held to service or labor in any one state, under the laws thereof escaping into another, shall in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from such service or labor, but shall be delivered upon claim of the party to whom such service or labor may be due."

And in the fourth section of the fourth article, it is provided that the United States shall, on the application of the Legislature or of the Executive of any one of the States, protect the same against domestic violence—an expression, if not exclusively to serve insurrection, undoubtedly selected with special and emphatic reference to it.

In no one of these four passages are slaves recognized as property. In the first three, where reference to them is direct, they are expressly designated as persons—persons to be represented in Congress, not by themselves, but by the votes of their masters; persons whom the then existing States might think proper to admit; persons held to service or labor, to be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such services or labor may be due. Not only is there no recognition of slaves as property—not only are they constantly referred to as persons, but in every instance they are so described that the engagement contracted with relation to them might be applicable to classes of persons other than slaves; and this studious uniformity of language throughout the whole Constitution could only arise from the determination to exclude from it any acknowledgment of slavery, as forming a component part of the supreme law of the land.

It was in this spirit of mutual concession and conciliation that the Constitution of the United States was formed and adopted, and it is in this spirit that I offer an amendment now before the committee. I will trespass no longer upon their indulgence, but will submit a few observations more on the subject, when the bill shall be reported to the House.—*Essex Gazette.*

From the Massachusetts Spy.

Opinions of the Civilized World, concerning Slavery.

I thought it my duty to expose the monstrous impiety and cruelty, not only of the slave trade, but of slavery itself, in whatever form it is found; and likewise to assert that no authority on earth can ever render such enormous iniquities legal.—GREENVILLE SHARP, as early as 1787.

Those are men-stealers, who abduct, keep, sell, or buy, slaves or freemen. To steal a man, is the highest kind of theft.—GROTIUS.

He who supports the system of slavery, is the enemy of the whole human race. He divides it into two societies of legal assassins—the oppressors and the oppressed. It is the same thing as proclaiming to the world, if you will preserve your own life, instantly take away mine, for I want to have yours.—ABBE RAYNAL.

This torturing system has been pursued so far as to prevent the development of the mental faculties. In Virginia, to have been able to read, cost a black man his life. He demanded that the Africans should share the benefits promised by American liberty; and supposed this demand by their own Bill of Rights. Where refutation is impossible, all tyrannies resemble each other. The negro suffered on the gallows!—ABBE GREGOIRE.

Slavery is vindicated in print, (1789) and defended in the House of Peers! Poor human reason, when wilt thou come to years of discretion!—HANNAH MORE.

Never was a system so big with wickedness and cruelty. In whatever part of it you direct your view, the eye finds no comfort, no satisfaction, no relief. It is the prerogative of slavery to separate from evil its concomitant good, and to reconcile discordant mischiefs. It robs war of its generosity, it deprives peace of its security. You have the vices of polished society, without its knowledge or its comforts; and the evils of barbarism, without its simplicity. Slavery is the full measure of pure, unmixed, unsophisticated wickedness; and scorning all competition, or comparison, it stands without a rival in the secure, undisputed possession of its detestable pre-eminence.—WILBERFORCE.

Slavery is a state so improper, so degrading, and so ruinous to the feelings and capacities of human nature, that it ought not to be suffered to exist.—EDMUND BURKE.

If you have made a happy slave, you have made a degraded man.—EDMUND BURKE.

Slavery is a mass, a system of enormities, which incontrovertibly bids defiance to every regulation which ingenuity can devise, or power effect, but a total extinction. Why ought slavery to be abolished? Because it is incurable iniquity. Why is injustice to remain for a single hour!—WILLIAM PITT.

Are we then fanatics? are we enthusiasts? because we cry, "do not rob! do not murder!" In whatsoever situation I may ever be, so long as I have a voice to speak, this question shall never be at an end. With regard to a regulation of slavery, my detestation of its existence induces me to know no such thing as a regulation of robbery, and a restriction of murder.—CHARLES JAMES FOX.

If the situation of slaves were as happy as servitude could make them, I must not commit the enormous crime of selling man to man. Personal freedom is a right, of which he who deprives a fellow-creature is absolutely criminal in so depriving him; and which he who withholds is no less criminal in withholding.—CHARLES JAMES FOX.

Man-stealers! The worst of thieves; in comparison of whom, highway robbers and house-breakers are innocent;—and men-buyers are exactly on a level with men-stealers.

It cannot be that either war or contract can give

any man such a property in another, as he has in his sheep and oxen. Much less is it possible that any child of man should ever be born a slave. If, therefore, you have any regard to justice, (to say nothing of mercy or the revealed will of God,) give liberty to whom liberty is due—that is, to every partaker of human nature.—JOHN WESLEY.

Slavery is made up of every crime that treachery, cruelty, and murder can invent; and men-stealers are the very worst of thieves. The most knavish tricks are practised by these dealers in human flesh; and if slaves think of our general character, they must suppose that Christians are devils, and that Christianity was forged in hell.—ROWLAND HILL.

It is as really wicked to rob a man of his liberty, as to rob him of his life; and it is much more wicked than to rob him of his property. To hold a man in a state of slavery, is to be every day guilty of robbing him of his liberty, or of man-stealing.—JONATHAN EDWARDS, Sept., 1791.

If we may judge of the future by the past, within fifty years from this time, it will be as shameful for a man to hold a negro slave, as to be guilty of common robbery or theft.—JONATHAN EDWARDS, Sept., 1791.

Slavery is, in every instance, wrong, unrighteous, and oppressive—a very great and crying sin—there being nothing of the kind equal to it on the face of the earth.—SAMUEL HOPKINS, 1776.

Slavery is injustice, which no consideration of policy can extenuate.—BISHOP HORSLEY.

The Christian religion is opposed to slavery in its spirit and its principles; it classes men-stealers among murderers of fathers and of mothers, and the most profane criminals upon earth.—BISHOP PORTER.

No man is by nature the property of another. The rights of nature must be some way forfeited, before they can be justly taken away.—SAMUEL JOHNSON.

Even the earth itself, which seems profusion under the cultivating hand of the free born laborer, shrinks into barrenness from the contaminating sweat of a slave.—MONTESQUIEU.

If we allow negroes to be men, it will begin to be believed that we ourselves are not Christians.—MONTESQUIEU.

Disguise thyself as thou wilt, still Slavery! thou art a bitter draught.—STERNE.

Not only the Christian religion, but Nature herself cries out against a state of slavery.—POPE LEO X.

Of all slaveholders under heaven, those of the United States appear to me to be most reprehensible; for man is never so truly odious as when he inflicts upon others that which he himself abominates.—EDWARD RUSHTON to Gen. Washington.

Slavery is a dominion and system of laws, the most merciless and tyrannical that ever were tolerated upon the face of the earth.—PALEY.

While I am indulging in my views of American prospects, and American liberty, it is mortifying to be told that in that very country a large portion of the people are slaves! It is a dark spot on the face of the nation. Such a state of things cannot always exist.—LAFAYETTE.

Robbers invade the property, and murderers the life of human beings; but he that holds another man in bondage, subjects the whole sum of his existence to oppression, bereaves him of every hope, and is therefore more detestable than robber and assassin combined.—THOMAS DAY.

Of all men living, an American citizen, who is the owner of slaves, is the most despicable—he is a political hypocrite of the very worst description.—O'CONNELL.

There is a law above all the enactments of human codes. It is the law written by the finger of God on the heart of man; and by that law, unchangeable and eternal, while men despise fraud, and loathe rapine, and abhor blood, they shall reject with indignation the wild and guilty phantasy, that man can hold property in man.—HENRY BROUGHTAM.

I hold the system of slavery to be a crime of the deepest dye, and I would deal with it as crimes ought to be dealt with.—T. FOWELL BUXTON.

Slavery is the infringement of all laws—a law having a tendency to preserve slavery would be the grossest sacrilege. I beg as fervently of my country as I would for the lives of my children, that you will never consent that crime, or color, or creed, should make any distinction in your Republic.—BOLIVAR.

I wish that the time may soon come, when all our inhabitants, of every color and denomination, shall be free and equal partakers of our political liberty.—JOHN JAY, 1785.

It is the double curse of slavery to degrade all concerned with it, doing or suffering. The slave is the lowest in the scale of human beings, except the slave dealer.—MONTGOMERY.

By sophistry, evil habits, neglect, and the impostures of an anti-Christian priesthood, joined in one conspiracy with the violence of tyrannical governors, the understandings of men may become so darkened, and their consciences so lethargic, that a necessity arises for the re-publication of self-evident truths, and this, too, with a voice of loud alarm and impassioned warning. Such were the truths with which Thomas Clarkson and his excellent confederates conquered the legalized banditti of men-stealers—the numerous and powerful perpetrators of rapine, murder and (worse than either) slavery!—COLERIDGE.

We, in an enlightened age, have greatly surpassed, in brutality and injustice, the most ignorant and barbarous ages; and while we are pretending to the finest feelings of humanity, are exercising unprecedented cruelty. We have planted slavery in the rank soil of sordid avarice; and the product has been misery in the extreme.—ELIAS HICKS.

The whole system is essentially and radically bad. Injustice and oppression are its fundamental principles. I do not affirm, or imagine that every slaveholder is therefore a wicked man; but if he be not, it is only upon the score of ignorance. Let us leave the deserts of the individual to Him who knoweth the heart; of his actions, we may speak; and we ought to speak in language of reprobation, disgust and abhorrence.—JONATHAN DYMOND.

The manner in which the duty of servants is inculcated, affords no ground for the assertion that the gospel authorizes one man to hold another in bondage, any more than the command to turn the other cheek justifies the infliction of violence.—PRESIDENT WATLAND.

The man, who, on hearing the claim to property in man, does not see and feel distinctly that it is a cruel usurpation, is hardly to be reached by reasoning; for it is hard to find any plainer principles than what he begins with denying.—CHANNING.

To steal or buy an African on his own shores is piracy. In this act the greatest wrong is inflicted, the most sacred right violated. But if a human being cannot, without infinite injustice, be seized as property, then he cannot, without equal wrong, be held as such.—CHANNING.

We hear of some of the southern states enriching themselves by breeding slaves for sale. Of all the licensed occupations of society, this is the most detestable. What! Rear human families, like herds of swine, and then scatter them to the four winds for gain!—CHANNING.

The household of the slave may be broken up arbitrarily by the master; but he finds his revenge, if revenge he asks, in the blight which the master's unfaithfulness sheds over his own domestic joys. A slave country reeks with licentiousness. It is tainted with a deadlier pestilence than the plague.—CHANNING.

Thus man devotes his brother, and destroys;
And worse than all, and most to be deplored,
As human nature's broadest, foulest blot,
Chains him and takes him, and exacts his sweat
With stripes, that mercy, with a bleeding heart,
Weeps when she sees inflicted on a beast.

COWPER.

Was man ordained, the slave of man, to toil,
Yoked with the brute and fettered to the soil—
Weighed in a tyrant's balance with his gold?
No! Nature stamped us in a heavenly mould;
She bade no wretch his thankless labor urge,
Nor trembling take the pittance and the scourge.

CAMPBELL.

Who can with patience for a moment see
This medley mass of pride and misery,
Of whips and chains, of manacles and rights,
Of slavish blacks and democratic whites?
To think that man, thou just and righteous God!
Should stand before thee with a tyrant's rod,
O'er creatures like himself—with souls from Thee—
And yet to boast of perfect liberty!

THOMAS MOORE.

Now, candid reader, in view of all this testimony, do you think American abolitionists are such "madmen and fanatics," as they have been represented? Have not good and wise men, in all parts of the world, been quite as mad as they?

From the *Pawtucket Record*, Aug. 27.
Baptists in England.

The Baptists in England mean not to be misunderstood any longer on the subject of slavery in this country.

At a meeting of the "Union," among other remarks and resolutions, were the following:—
The Rev. S. Green, of Walworth, proposed the following resolution:—

That the connection with the Baptist churches in the United States contemplated by this Union, and actually resulting from its proceedings, consist wholly in the maintenance of a beneficial correspondence, having for its object the advantage of both parties, by an unfettered expression of opinion on all subjects connected with Christian consistency, the advancement of religion, and the glory of God.

The Rev. J. P. Saffery, of Salisbury, seconded the resolution.

The Rev. T. Price, of Devonshire Square, supported the resolution, observing that he must, at whatever risk, add a few words. He wished the meeting distinctly to understand, and he wished the whole nation and America to understand, the nature of the resolution as well as their feelings in reference to it. It was briefly, that, if the Baptists of America did not regard, with the attention which it demanded, the whole subject of negro slavery, from that moment the Baptists of England must relinquish their union with them. (Loud bursts of applause.) If the American Baptists told the Baptists of England that their communications on that subject could not be laid before the brethren when they met, it would then become the baptists of England to tell their American brethren, in the fear of God, that they could no longer hold communion with them. (Cheering repeated.)

Mr. Brock—Is that the sentiment of the meeting? Will it go forth to America as such? (Cries of "Yes! yes!" from all parts.)

The Chairman (with emphasis)—It is my duty to take very distinctly, and put it to the vote, upon which it was carried by acclamation.

The Rev. J. H. Hinton then moved a series of resolutions, as follows:—
That this meeting presents its Christian acknowledgments for the kindness shown to its deputation by the churches in America—both those of other denominations and those of our own—especially those meeting in the Triennial Convention of Baptist churches. That it holds in high admiration their munificent and well sustained exertions for the dissemination of the gospel, and for the education of Christian ministers and missionaries; and most cordially rejoicing in the large bestowment of the Divine blessing upon their widely extended labors, it receives with pleasure the kind invitation to continued intercourse, addressed to them by transatlantic brethren.

That this meeting refers with regret to the deep-rooted prejudices which so extensively prevail in America against free persons of color, by which many and grievous injuries are inflicted upon them; amongst these, more especially does it refer to that law which is understood to prevail in one or more of the states, which prohibits any one from teaching "any person of color, slave or free, to read or write," a law directly opposed to every feeling—therefore treats the ministers and churches of Christ, in whom is neither "Jew nor Greek, barbarian nor Scythian, bond nor free," to cast from them such ungenerous and unholly prejudices, and to put the enslaved people in possession of their social rights, in the seats of learning, the fellowship of citizens, and the sanctuaries of the Most High.

That this meeting, convinced of the paramount importance of the objects to which these resolutions relate most earnestly, most respectfully, most affectionately and most solemnly requests that large and influential section of the Christian church, the Baptists in the United States of America, whose churches (it is computed) more than 600,000 members, and whose rise and progress, from the days of Roger Williams, display so much of the grace and power of the Redeemer—by their sense of equity, by their hope of salvation, to rouse themselves to the great plain duty of securing first the rights of their oppressed and degraded fellow-subjects, and then withholding no effort from the general cause of humanity and freedom, until the jubilee of universal emancipation is proclaimed.

Texas—Acknowledgment of the South.

Some sage persons have pretended that the stories about Texas being wanted by the south as a slave-mart, and an additional slave territory, were all idle whims of the abolitionists. Here is an acknowledgment from a southern paper, the *Mobile (Ala.) Advertiser*, which is sufficiently explicit on this point. "The south wish to have Texas admitted into the union for two reasons: first, to equalize the south with the north; and secondly, as a convenient and safe place calculated from its peculiarly good soil and salubrious climate for a slave population. Interest and political safety both and alike prompt the action and enforce the argument. The south contends that preservation and justice to themselves call for that aid to be tendered to them which would be given by the acquisition of Texas. They are not safe as they are. They are not unsecured in their free states. Their exposure to insurrection is four-fold, with not one forth the means to redress their grievances. They contend that they have an internal foe within, and an awful foe in all those who demand the emancipation of their slaves, and who call upon them to give up their property now and forever. The question is therefore put by the south to Congress and the country.—Shall we have justice done us by the admission of Texas into the union, whenever that admission may be asked by the Texans themselves? The question is a fair one, and must soon be met by Congress and the nation. The north almost to a man will answer, No. The west will be divided, and the discussion of the question will find two strong and powerful parties; the one in favor of Texas, a slaveholding province, and the other against it."

ANTI-ABOLITION RIOTERS.—Some days ago, says the *Portland Advertiser*, we published an account of a disturbance of a public meeting in Bridgton, which was led on by Nathaniel S. Littlefield, Esq. of that town. Mr. Littlefield and the associates disturbers, to the number of twelve or thirteen, have been indicted before the grand jury, and pleaded guilty. Mr. Littlefield has been fined twenty-five dollars, and the others five dollars each.—*Essex Gazette.*

ANTI-SLAVERY PUBLICATIONS.

Just received and for sale at the Depository of the Ohio Anti-Slavery Society.

BOUND VOLUMES.

Single copy.

Cabinet of freedom, Edited by Hon. Wm. Jay, Prof. Bush and Gerrit Smith—Containing Clarkson's History of the abolition of the Slave Trade.	\$0 75
Lectures of George Thompson, with a full report of his discussion with Mr. Borthwick. Channing on Slavery.	50
A new edition of Mrs. Childs' appeal, revised by the author, at the reduced price of	37 1/2
The Fountain, a small pocket manual containing a text for each day in the year, with an opposite anti-slavery sentiment or fact.	18 1/2
Life of Granville Sharpe, by C. Stuart, ornamented with a beautiful copperplate likeness.	37 1/2
Anti-Slavery Record, vol. 1, neatly bound, with an Appendix, making 174 pages.	31 1/2
An inquiry into the character and tendency of the American Colonization and Anti-Slavery Societies, by the Hon. Wm. Jay, 3d edition.	38
A Sketch of the laws relating to slavery in the United States, by G. W. Stroud.	62 1/2
Memoirs of Phillis Wheatley a native African and a slave.	25
The Oasis, by Mrs. D. L. Child, of Boston, Author of an Appeal in favor of that class of Americans called Africans.	1 00
Bourne's Picture of slavery in the U. S.	50
Phelps' Lectures on slavery.	50
Rankin's Letters on slavery in the U. S.	25
A small collection of Anti-Slavery Hymns.	06
Memoir of James Jackson, a colored boy who died in Boston, Oct. 31, 1833, aged 6 years and 11 months.	25
Memoirs of Wm. Wilberforce by Thomas Price.	25
Spirit of Humanity.	50
Right and Wrong in Boston.	25
Slaves Friend, neatly bound.	25

PAMPHLETS.

Per hundred.

Proceedings of the State Anti-Slavery Convention held at Utica, Oct. 21, and the first meeting of the N. Y. State A. S. Soc. held at Peterboro, Oct. 22, 1835.	\$8 00
A small tract of 16 pages containing and extracted from one of Rev. C. G. Finney's Lectures on Revivals, also an extract of a letter from James G. Birney, Esq. of Kentucky, to a gentleman in this city; all relating to the duty of churches in reference to slavery and slave-holders.	2 00
Juvenile Poems, ornamented with nine wood engravings, for the use of free American children.	10 00
A Tract of 16 pages, containing the Declaration of Sentiments and Constitution of the American Anti-Slavery Society, together with those parts of the Constitution of the United States which are supposed to have any relation to slavery.	1 50
Letter to a Member of Congress of the U. S. from an English Clergyman, including a republication of the tract entitled "Every man his own property."	10 00
Second Annual Report of the American Anti-Slavery Society.	13 00
Proceedings of the Ohio Anti-Slavery Convention.	8 00
The Injustice and Impolicy of the Slave-Trade and of slavery illustrated in a Sermon, by Jonathan Edwards, D. D.	5 00
The Maryland Scheme.	3 00
The West India Question by C. Stuart.	8 00
Abrogation of the Seventh Commandment, by American Churches.	3 00
First Annual Report N. F. A. S. Soc.	8 00
Declaration of the Philad. Convention.	50
Birney's Letter to the churches.	2 00
British opinions of the Am. Col. Soc.	4 00
A Brief Review of the First Annual Report of the Am. Anti-Slavery Society, by David M. Reese, M. D. of New-York, Dissected by Martin Mar, Quack M. D.	3 00
The Wesleyan Extra, a Tract of 24 pages, containing Wesley's Thoughts upon slavery published in the year 1774.	1 50
Anti-Slavery Record, published monthly by the Am. Anti-Slavery Society.	1 25
The Slave's Friend, published monthly, being a series of Nos. for children.	80
Debate on Modern Abolitionism in the Gen. Conference of the Methodist Episcopal church.	12 50
Quarterly Anti-Slavery Magazine, Nos. 2 & 3	18 75
First Report of Ohio Anti-Slavery Society.	8 00
Proceedings of the Rhode Island Anti-Slavery Convention.	12 50
First Annual Report of the New York Young Men's Anti-Slavery Society.	6 00
Address to the Society of Friends, by Chas. Marion.	4 00
Wesley's Thoughts on slavery.	2 00
Address to the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal church.	2 00
Fruits of Colonization.	1 00
Evils and Cure of Slavery.	2 50
Authentic Anecdotes of American Slavery.	2 50
Juvenile Poems.	8 00
Childs Oration.	3 00
The Abolitionist.	3 00
An account of the interviews between a committee of the Mass. Anti-Slavery Society, and the committee of the Legislature.	9 00
Anti-Slavery Catechism by Mrs. Childs.	6 00
Narrative of Amos Dresser.	5 00
Address to the Presbyterians of Kentucky, by a committee from the Synod of Kentucky.	3 00
Substance of Thompson's Lecture.	5 00
Immediate, not Gradual Emancipation.	6 25
Forten's Address.	3 00
Full Statement.	10 00
Productions of Mrs. Maria Stewart.	6 00
Address to the churches, by John Rankin.	3 0